FBIS DAILY REPORT

MIDDLE EAST & SOUTH ASIA REVIEW

17 MAY 1983

Lebanon

The heads of the Lebanese, Israeli, and U.S. delegations signed the French and Arabic texts of the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement at Khaldah and the English and Hebrew texts at Qiryat Shemona in ceremonies relayed live by Beirut and Jerusalem radios on 17 May. The previous day the Knesset approved the accord by a large majority with the opposition Alignment abstaining, according to Jerusalem radio. Earlier, the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies approved a recommendation supporting the government's efforts to attain full sovereignty, the speaker announced over Beirut radio after the session. The proposal thus adopted was made by former Prime Minister Sa'ib Salam, who told the deputies in a speech broadcast by the radio that, since the chamber could ratify the agreement only after it had been signed by the president, it should meanwhile unanimously express support for Lebanese "domestic unity." He also said Lebanon should negotiate with Syria in a spirit of "brotherly love," disclosing that he had received information that "the door is open for negotiation" with the Syrians.

Commending the draft agreement to the chamber in a lengthy statement broadcast by Beirut radio, Foreign Minister Elie Salim said that, although Lebanon has accepted conditions and restrictions, these are "temporary, acceptable, and reasonable" and "the necessary price" for recovering Lebanese territory without signing a peace treaty or establishing normal relations with Israel. The agreement will strengthen rather than undermine Lebanon's commitments to the Arab League and the joint Arab defense treaty, its relations with Syria, and Syrian security, he added. Noting previous Syrian and PLO commitments to withdraw from Lebanon, Salim said the Lebanese have "no doubt" Syria and the PLO will cooperate to implement the goals of the agreement, and he added that Lebanon will coordinate directly with the Syrians in order to emphasize that the agreement will not affect their security. Expressing concern that Israel will turn southern Lebanon into another West Bank and will divert the Litani River waters into the Israeli irrigation system if it continues its occupation, Salim said Lebanon must not lose the south in order "to satisfy slogans and pride." The foreign minister revealed that Lebanon has informed the United States that if "for any reason" Israel does not withdraw from Lebanon the latter will consider the agreement "suspended or canceled."

In other developments Moroccan King Hassan II and UAE President Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhayyan expressed support for the Lebanese Government's position, according to Beirut and Voice of Lebanon radios.

Syria

Voice of Lebanon radio reported that Syria has called up Armed Forces reservists and also said the Muslim Brotherhood recently clashed with security forces in Aleppo.

PLO

The agreement on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon is a "grave" one "which violates UN Security Council resolutions and infringes on Lebanon's independence, security, and Arab commitments,"a Fatah statement broadcast by San'a' Voice of Palestine Radio announced after a lengthy meeting of the Fatah Central Committee under PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat in Damascus. According to the statement, the Central Committee also discussed the "undisciplined behavior" that recently took place within a Fatah military unit in Al-Biqa' and the resulting "exaggerated and suspect" media campaign and foreign interference to "distort the stand of the movement and undermine its unity." The Central Committee expressed satisfaction at the "wisdom" with which all sides are approaching the problem and emphasized the importance of "democratic dialogue" within the movement to resolve problems. Meanwhile, Yasir 'Arafat inspected PLO units in Al-Biqa' for the third time in recent days, Radio Monte Carlo reported citing WAFA.

In another development an "official" Palestinian source in Damascus said an exchange of prisoners of war between the PLO and Israel will take place only through the International Red Cross, San'a' Voice of Palestine radio reported. While asserting that the slow progress of these negotiations is a result of Israel's failure to meet the PLO's conditions, the official added that the negotiations are continuing.

GCC Mission to Iran, Iraq

Iran wants to stop the oil spill as soon as possible and will direct all its resources toward solving the problem, Majlis Speaker 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani said during his meeting in Tehran with a GCC mission headed by the UAE and Kuwaiti foreign ministers, IRNA reported. The speaker also called on regional governments to "compel" Iraq to cease its "adventurist acts." The GCC mission, which also plans to hold talks with Iraqi officials, is to discuss political issues involved in the protection of the region's maritime environment prior to the 18 May GCC Ministerial Council session in Saudi Arabia, WAKH said earlier. The GCC mission also conferred with Iranian Foreign minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati, who said the visit had "nothing to do" with the Iran-Iraq war and that no talks in this respect were included on the agenda, according to Tehran radio's Arabic service and IRNA. Velayati stressed that this did not mean Iran rejected the efforts of regional countries to end the war.

FBIS **DAILY REPORT**

CONTENTS

Middle East & Africa

Vol V No 096 *17 May 1983*

MIDDLE EAST & SOUTH ASIA REVIEW i

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

'Arafat's Activities in Syria, Lebanon Reported ..... A 1
Third Visit to Al-Biqa' *[Radio Monte Carlo]* ..... A 1
Meetings in Damascus, Al-Biqa' *[Baghdad Voice of PLO]* ..... A 1
Details of Internal Fatah Differences Reported *[AL-KHALIJ 4 May]* ..... A 1
'Undisciplined Behavior' Revealed *[Radio Monte Carlo]* ..... A 2
PLO Spokesman Denies Clashes *[Radio Monte Carlo]* ..... A 3
Statement Against 'Arafat Noted *[Radio Monte Carlo]* ..... A 3
Tripoli Views PLO Dissident Group, Al-Biqa' Dispute ..... A 3
More Officials Join Dissidents *[Tripoli]* ..... A 4
Fatah 'Revolutionary Movement' Statement *[JANA]* ..... A 4
Lebanese-Israeli Agreement Critically Assessed ..... A 4
PLO Leadership Rejects Accord *[Radio Monte Carlo]* ..... A 4
Fatah Condemns Agreement *[Radio Monte Carlo]* ..... A 5
Arab Silence Scored *[Baghdad Voice of PLO]* ..... A 5
'Silence Threatens Palestinian Issue' *[Baghdad Voice of PLO]* ..... A 5
U.S. Mideast Policy Unchanged *[Baghdad Voice of PLO]* ..... A 6
Lebanese Urged To Resist *[Baghdad Voice of PLO]* ..... A 6
Jordan Rejects Appointment of PLO Official *[AL-QUDS 2 May]* ..... A 7
Oman's Qabus Reportedly Meets Jordan's King Husayn *[MENA]* ..... A 7

ARABIAN PENINSULA

GULF AFFAIRS

UAE, Kuwaiti Foreign Ministers Leave for Tehran ..... C 1
Al-Jabir Predeparture Statement ..... C 1

BAHRAIN

Amir Meets With Libyan Envoy, Receives Message ..... C 1
Lebanese Envoy Arrives With Message 17 May ..... C 1

KUWAIT

Amir Receives Reagan Message on Gulf War *[AL-QABAS 15 May]* ..... C 2
Qatari Heir Apparent To Visit 23-25 May *[AS-SIYASAH 15 May]* ..... C 2

OMAN

Iranian Hijacking Attempt Thwarted in Muscat ..... C 2

QATAR

Lebanese Envoy Meets With Amir, Makes Statement *[Beirut]* ..... C 2

SAUDI ARABIA

'More Positive' U.S. Stand on Palestinians Urged ..... C 3
Crown Prince Receives Libyan Envoy 16 May ..... C 3
Source Denies Prince To Meet FRG Officials ..... C 3

UAE

Lebanese Envoy Briefs President on Agreement *[VOL]* ..... C 3
Departs Abu Dhabi 16 May ..... C 4

PDRY

Libyan Envoy Arrives in Aden With Message ..... C 4

EGYPT

Mubarak Meets With Ministers, Businessmen ..... D 1
Mubarak Sends Message To Romania's Ceausescu ..... D 1
Economic Protocol Signed With Romania ..... D 1
'Ali Calls Lebanese-Israeli Agreement 'Important' ..... D 1
'Ali Supports OAU Conference at Addis Ababa ..... D 2
Ghali Interviewed on Middle East Issues ..... D 2
Ghali Meets With UN Information Delegation *[MONDAY MORNING 8 May]* ..... D 3
FRG Energy Experts Conclude Week-Long Visit ..... D 3
New Ambassador to Israel To Be Appointed *[OCTOBER 15 May]* ..... D 3
Speaker Announces Nile Valley Parliament Members ..... D 3
Dailies Urge Foreign Withdrawals From Lebanon ..... D 4
Opposition Paper Decries Government on Democracy *[AL-AHALI 11 May]* ..... D 4

IRAQ

Communique on 15-16 May War Operations ..... E 1
Commentary Criticizes Tehran, Damascus, Tripoli ..... E 1

JORDAN

King Sends Letter to U.S. Arabs Conference ..... F 1
Dailies View Syrian Rejection of Agreement ..... F 2
Weinberger's Warning to Syria, USSR Reported ..... F 2
Prince Hasan Meets Reagan, Advisers 16 May ..... F 3
Grants Television Interview ..... F 3
Moroccan Delegation Arrives in Amman 15 May ..... F 3
Delivers Message to Husayn ..... F 3
Chinese Delegation Arrives in Amman 14 May ..... F 4
Speakers Receives Delegation ..... F 4

LEBANON

Delegations Arrive in Khaldah To Sign Accord ..... G 1
Fattal Speech at Khaldah Signing Ceremony ..... G 1
Salim Delivers Government Statement 16 May ..... G 2
Sa'ib Salam Calls for Negotiations With Syria ..... G 8
Speaker al-As'ad Comments on Chamber Session ..... G 9
Deputies Say Chamber Recommendation Not Unanimous *[Voice of Arab Lebanon]* ..... G 10
Qulaylat Meets With USSR Envoy Soldatov *[Voice of Arab Lebanon]* ..... G 10
Nationalist Groups Reject Israeli Agreement *[Damascus]* ..... G 10
Al-Murabitun Issues Statement On Draft Agreement *[Voice of Arab Lebanon]* ..... G 11
VOL Reports Call up of Syrian Reservists ..... G 12
Syrians Cut All Roads Linking Beirut, Damascus ..... G 12
Lebanese Forces Score Syrian Rejection of Pact ..... G 12
Strikes To Be Staged To Protest Accord Signing *[Voice of Arab Lebanon]* ..... G 13

SYRIA

Khaddam Comments on Agreement, Other Issues ..... H 1

AL-KHALIJ Interview *[15 May]* ..... H 1
Damascus Reports AS-SAFIR Interview ..... H 2
Khaddam, Talas Brief Cabinet on Situation ..... H 3
People's Assembly Urges Lebanese To Foil Pact ..... H 3
Press Commentaries View Draft Agreement ..... H 4
ATH-THAWRAH Commentary ..... H 4
AL-BA'TH Criticizes Agreement ..... H 4
Further AL-BA'TH Criticism ..... H 5
ATH-THAWRAH Commentary 15 May ..... H 5
IZVESTIYA Expresses Support ..... H 6
Radio Commentary Condemns Draft Agreement ..... H 6
Further Commentary ..... H 7
Al-Asad Receives Lebanese National Figures ..... H 7
Palestine Broadcast on Bridge Crossing Measures ..... H 8
Khaddam Confers With CSSR Officials 16 May ..... H 8
Delegations Hold Talks ..... H 8

ISRAEL

Agreement Signed After Knesset Approves Accord ..... I 1
Knesset Debate Reported ..... I 1
Rabin, Arens Debate Speeches ..... I 1
Signing Ceremonies Begin ..... I 2
Kimche, Fattal on Agreement ..... I 2
Shamir on Accord, Understanding with U.S. ..... I 2
Arens Interviewed on Syria, Lebanon War *[MA'ARIV 13 May]* ..... I 3
Haddad Sees 'War of Independence' With Syria ..... I 7
IDF Studying PLO's POW Exchange Conditions ..... I 7
Arens Says First Lavi Plane To Be Ready in 1986 *[JERUSALEM POST 16 May]* ..... I 7
Soviet Visitor on Nuclear Weapons, Jordan *[YEDI'OT AHARONOT 15 May]* ..... I 8

NORTH AFRICA

LIBYA

People's Foreign Liaison Committee Statement ..... Q 1
Paper Discloses CIA Activity in U.S. Embassies *[AL-ZAHAF AL-AKHDAR 7 May]* ..... Q 2

MOROCCO

Lebanese Envoy Arrives With Al-Jumayyil Message ..... Q 3
Meets With King Hassan ..... Q 3
Opposition Party To Boycott 10 June Election ..... Q 4

SUDAN

Compulsory Military Service Bill Approved ..... Q 4

TUNISIA

Lebanese Envoy Arrives in Tunis 16 May *[Beirut]* ..... Q 4
Bourguiba Receives Libya's Al-'Ubaydi 16 May ..... Q 4

WESTERN SAHARA

Minister Accuses Morocco, U.S. of 'Sabotage' ..... Q 4

EAST AFRICA

ETHIOPIA

Eritrean, Other Regional Appointments Reported ..... R 1

KENYA

Government To Hold Early Election in September ..... R 1
Minister Affirms Loyalty to Arap Moi ..... R 1

CENTRAL AFRICA

CHAD

Further Reportage on Factional Fighting ..... S 1
Authorities Deny Faya-Largeau Surrounded ..... S 1
Rebels Claim Minister Killed ..... S 1
Bardai Charges FAN Causes Border Incidents ..... S 1

GABON

Bongo Returns From Guinea, Makes Statement ..... S 2

WEST AFRICA

GHANA

Enin Meets With DPRK Delegation 16 May ..... T 1

MALI

Algiers Paper Interviews President Moussa Traore *[EL MOUDJAHID 9 May]* ..... T 1

NIGER

Classes Resume at Niamey University 16 May ..... T 2

NIGERIA

Government Denies Loan Agreement With IMF ..... T 2

SENEGAL

Boucetta Hands Note to President, Goes to Guinea ..... T 2

SIERRA LEONE

Stevens Denies Constitution To Be Changed ..... T 3

TOGO

West Germany's Warnke Visits Koutouboug, Kara ..... T 3

SOUTHERN AFRICA

ANGOLA

Dos Santos Receives Special Envoy From Sao Tome ..... U 1

MADAGASCAR

FRG Deputy Economic Cooperation Minister Arrives ..... U 1

MALAWI

Opposition Leader Seeks Thatcher's Intercession ..... U 1
Parliament To Meet Before Being Dissolved ..... U 1

MOZAMBIQUE

NOTICIAS Lists Central Committee Members *[1 May]* ..... U 1

SOUTH AFRICA

SADF Has No Comment on Zimbabwean Conviction ..... U 2
Treurnicht Renews Appeals for Rightwing Unity *[RAND DAILY MAIL 14 May]* ..... U 2

ZAMBIA

Former Cabinet Minister Criticizes Government *[Johannesburg]* ..... U 2

ZIMBABWE

Government To Institute 'Executive President' ..... U 3
Mugabe on Councillors' 'Unilateral Decisions' ..... U 3
Man Sentenced for Preparing To Train in RSA *[SAPA]* ..... U 3
Pretoria Recruits Mercenaries for Destabilization ..... U 3
Iraq Accused of Frustrating Relations With Iran ..... U 3
Harare Radio To Broadcast SWAPO Programs *[Lisbon]* ..... U 4
Radio Truth Warns of Move To Check Opposition ..... U 4

'Arafat's Activities in Syria, Lebanon Reported

Third Visit to Al-Biqa'

JN170606 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 0500 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] The Palestinian News Agency, WAFA, has mentioned that PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat inspected for the third time yesterday the Palestinian forces positioned in Lebanon's Al-Biqa'. 'Arafat was accompanied by Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir], deputy commander of the Palestinian revolution forces, and several Palestinian commanders. WAFA noted that 'Arafat briefed the military commanders on the current situation in the region in light of the recent internal and external developments.

Meetings in Damascus, Al-Biqa'

JN161750 Baghdad Voice of PLO in Arabic 1615 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] During the past 2 days Brother Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] inspected the Palestinian revolution forces in Al-Biqa'. Brother Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir], deputy commander in chief of the Palestinian revolution forces, and Abu al-Mu'tasim [Ahmad 'Afanah], deputy chief of staff, accompanied Abu 'Ammar on his inspection tour. During his tour, the commander in chief met with the brother officers and soldiers of the Al-Yarmuk Forces. The commanders of the armed forces and units briefed him on the preparations being made by the revolution forces to confront the Zionist aggression. He reviewed the Arab situation with them in light of the current developments. Brother Abu 'Ammar inspected the positions of the Al-Yarmuk, Ash-Shaqif, Badr, and Al-Karamah Forces and met with these forces' commanders and fighters.

In Damascus brother leader Abu 'Ammar met with some brother military men and officials of organs, popular unions, and Fatah cadres in the presence of Brother Abu Jihad, deputy commander in chief of the Palestinian revolution forces. At the beginning of the meeting, Brother Abu 'Ammar reviewed the political and military situation in light of the current developments, including the Israeli threats and military concentrations as well as the escalation of the U.S. Administration's hostile political onslaught against the PLO and the Palestinian people, including the recent threats.

The brother commander in chief reaffirmed that the PLO, while waging a valiant, continuous struggle on all the political, diplomatic, military, and popular levels against the Zionist enemy and its allies in more than one front and position, standing in our Arab nation's forward trench of struggle to perplex and foil the U.S. imperialist schemes, and saying no to Reagan and to his administration's hostile programs to ensure hegemony over the Arab region and control its destinies, is only continuing its militant role to awaken the Arabs from their slumber and to get out of the current Arab impasse.

Brother Abu 'Ammar said that the PLO, which has not stopped fighting the Zionist-U.S. enemy supported by the national Lebanese forces, believes that to emerge from the present Arab impasse means adopting the decision of fighting and war. He pointed out that the next war is the only means currently available to rechart the political map through an Arab political, military movement supporting the national Palestinian-Lebanese struggle.

Regarding the recent developments in Lebanon as represented in the approval of the Lebanese-U.S.-Isreali agreement, brother leader Abu 'Ammar said: Some Arabs have helped in the establishment of a one-party system in Lebanon so that this party can impose its political conditions as well as the conditions of its Israeli-U.S. alliances, which are currently being opposed by national Lebanese resistance.

Details of Internal Fatah Differences Reported

GF141536 Ash-Shariqah AL-KHALIJ in Arabic 14 May 83 pp 1, 14

[By AL-KHALIJ correspondent Jum'ah al-Lami]

[Text] Damascus — The Fatah Central Committee yesterday began its most critical meetings since the battle of Beirut. Yasir 'Arafat and most Fatah leaders arrived in Damascus on 13 May. They have begun their meetings and consultations to study organizational issues that have emerged after 'Arafat made his new military appointments, which have been rejected by a number of Fatah political and military leaders.

In a statement to AL-KHALIJ on his arrival in Damascus on 14 May, Abu Iyad [Salah Khalaf] said that the situation in Fatah will be overcome. He emphasized that all Fatah leaders and rank and file are anxious to maintain the movement's unity.

Fatah's organizational crisis was exacerbated 4 days ago when 'Arafat dismissed Colonel Abu Musa, deputy commander of the military operations room, and Colonel Abu Majdi, official in charge of training, and appointed Al-Haj Isma'il — who was commander of the Fatah forces in the central sector of southern Lebanon during the Zionist invasion — as commander of the Palestinian forces in northern Lebanon, and Colonel Abu Hajim as commander of the Palestinian forces in Al-Biqa'. 'Arafat had also dismissed the commander of the militias, Abu Akram, who is a member of the Fatah Revolutionary Council for Lebanon.

Palestinian sources said that these officers have joined the wing led by Fatah Central Committee members Qadri [Samih Quwayq] and Abu Salih [Nimr Salih].

Five days ago Colonel Abu Musa issued an order of the day to all Fatah forces in Al-Biqa' asking them to receive orders from him alone in his capacity as commander of the forces in Al-Biqa'. However, the actual military commander of Fatah, Abu Jihad, moved and encircled the rebelling forces in Al-Biqa' and stressed the need for them to abide by the decisions of the Fatah leadership. Immediately after, a seven-man committee of Fatah rank and file members began to mediate between the two sides. Their efforts prevented a deterioration in the situation and the exacerbation of the differences but did not completely resolve the problem.

Two general orders were issued yesterday, one by the Fatah leadership and the other by the Abu Salih and Qadri group. The order of the day issued by the Fatah leadership described Colonel Abu Musa's action in declaring himself as commander of Fatah forces in Al-Biqa' as mutiny, and accused the Abu Salih and Qadri group of having links with a number of Arab regimes that are seeking to contain Palestinian action. The order issued by the Abu Salih and Qadri group said: "The recent appointments by 'Arafat are a beginning of the withdrawal of Palestinian forces from Al-Biqa'."

At noon on 13 May the political differences between the two groups began to emerge. The Abu Salih and Qadri group has made several observations on Abu 'Ammar's political moves since the departure of the Palestinian resistance from Beirut, and they have rejected the possible consequences of these moves.

On the morning of 13 May a Palestinian leader visited Abu Jihad, deputy commander in chief of the forces of the Palestinian revolution, and asserted to him the importance of acting to contain the situation. The leader quoted Abu Jihad as saying: "We are serious in building Fatah's unity on a firm basis. Our minds and hearts are open to the views of brothers. We had invited Brother Qadri to the meetings of the Fatah Central Committee but he did not attend. He is still a Fatah Central Committee member. As for Abu Salih, his membership of the committee is frozen."

Abu Jihad emphasized the importance of Palestinian unity in the present stage and the importance of resorting to democratic dialogue among members of the same organization and not resorting to the use of arms against brothers-in-arms.

Qadri and Abu Salih said to the Palestinian leader mediating between the two sides: "The appointments have a political character. The resolution of the crisis requires the repealing of the recent military appointments as a prelude to a dialogue and an end to the crisis."

Well-informed Palestinian sources say that Arab and international efforts are being made to bring together the various leaders for a discussion. At 1100 on 13 May Qadri met with an ambassador of one of the socialist countries for 90 minutes. They discussed the current situation and the latest developments.

During interviews given to AL-KHALIJ on 13 May by several leaders of the PFLP and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the leaders agreed that the dispute between the two wings of Fatah is not new. They also agreed that any split within Fatah is harmful to the entire Palestinian action, and affirmed that all Palestinian leaders are anxious that these differences are overcome.

The attitude of the PFLP-General Command [led by Ahmad Jibril] is to give immediate support to the Abu Salih-Qadri group.

Abu al-'Abbas, deputy secretary general of the Palestinian Liberation Front [jabhat tahrir filastin], in a statement to AL-KHALIJ, appealed to every Arab citizen and organization to declare their anxiousness to maintain Fatah's unity "because splitting the movement serves only Israel."

With regard to the meetings of Fatah leaders on 13 May, a well-informed Palestinian source told AL-KHALIJ that 'Arafat will be decisive and tough, and that he may rescind the appointment of Al-Haj Isma'il and Abu Hajim and appoint two others instead of them, but he will not repeat the decision to dismiss Abu Musa and Abu Majdi. The source believes that the Fatah Central Committee may call for a meeting of the Fatah Revolutionary Council to be held very soon in order to resolve the matter completely.

Ahmad 'Abd ar-Rahman, the official in charge of the PLO's unified information office, has denied an AFP report on clashes among the Fatah forces in Al-Biqa'. 'Abd ar-Rahman said: "There are some problems and difficulties among the Palestinians. This may happen sometimes. However, there have been no armed clashes."

'Undisciplined Behavior' Revealed

JN161302 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1215 GMT 16 May 83

[Telephone dispatch by Radio Monte Carlo correspondent in Damascus Louis Faris — recorded]

[Text] The Fatah Central Committee this morning issued a statement, saying that it held an expanded lengthy meeting in Damascus under Abu 'Ammar to discuss the developments in the region, foremost being the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement.

In a first public official stand on this agreement, Fatah described the agreement as dangerous, violating Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509 and infringing on Lebanon's security and its Arab commitments as well as on the Arab security.

The Central Committee expressed its support for the stands of the Lebanese forces that reject the agreement. Also, for the first time, Fatah officially and publicly revealed what had taken place within the movement. The statement said that the Central Committee, at its meeting last night, discussed the recent undisciplined behavior inside a military unit. It also reviewed the propaganda campaigns and external interferences to distort the movement's stands and harm its unity and cohesion. The statement added that the Central Committee listened to a report compiled by the revolutionary and military cadres committee that has been formed by the Central Committee, and, according to the statement, was assigned with investigating the incident.

The statement pointed out that the Central Committee expressed satisfaction with the way this incident has been handled, stressing the need to pursue the democratic dialogue within the movement's revolutionary bodies to solve this incident.

The Central Committee also listened to a detailed report on the military situation presented by Yasir 'Arafat in light of his two recent visits to the Palestinian military units in Lebanon's Al-Biqa'.

It is expected that Abu 'Ammar will pay a third visit to Al-Biqa' within the next few hours.

PLO Spokesman Denies Clashes

JN131514 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1500 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] In a statement in Tunis today, PLO Spokesman Ahmad 'Abd ar-Rahman unequivocally and officially denied the occurrence of armed clashes among the Palestinian forces in Al-Biqa'. He denied any connection between PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat's surprise arrival in Damascus last night and the reported outbreak of clashes between rival elements of the Palestinian forces.

Ahmad 'Abd ar-Rahman said Yasir 'Arafat returned to Damascus to continue talks with the Syrian officials to bolster political and military coordination between Syria and the PLO.

Statement Against 'Arafat Noted

JN140634 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 0500 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] In Damascus, an authoritative Palestinian source has stated that Yasir 'Arafat will meet with President Hafiz al-Asad in the next few days. This meeting was agreed upon during the meeting between 'Arafat and Al-Asad in Damascus on 3 May.

Yasir 'Arafat, who arrived in Damascus yesterday, will preside over a series of important political and military meetings and a meeting of the Palestinian command, which will be attended by the PLO Executive Committee members, the secretaries general of the Palestinian resistance factions, and representatives of the Palestinian organizations.

In a statement in Tunis yesterday, Fatah stressed that it had not issued any statement signed by the command of Al-'Asifah, which is the military wing of Fatah. Fatah stressed that it had nothing to do with the statement, which was issued by persons affiliated with Abu Salih, a dissident from Fatah, and signed by the Al-'Asifah Forces' General Command.

Reports from Damascus mention that this statement accuses the Fatah command of preparing to recognize the Zionist enemy and criticizes Yasir 'Arafat for meeting with some Israeli officials in Tunis and for maintaining close relations with Arab regimes that are hostile to the Palestinian cause.

WAFA said that the dissemination of such a statement is part of the suspect campaigns against the Palestinian people and their principal organization, Fatah, at a time when the Palestinian cause and the Arab nation are passing through a critical and delicate stage.

In addition, a well-informed Palestinian source in Tunis has accused parties from outside the Palestinian revolution whom he did not name of working to create a crisis within the Fatah movement and to form a dissident trend in the ranks of the Palestinian revolution by disseminating false reports and giving importance to minor incidents that will be settled soon.

Tripoli Views PLO Dissident Group, Al-Biqa' Dispute

LD161705 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] In a recent statement, Yasir 'Arafat said that war is the only way to change the balance of pwoer with the Zionist enemy. Observers link this statement with the recent sharp dispute inside Fatah, the biggest Palestinian group, which has led to several armed clashes between Palestinian groups in the Al-Biqa' Valley. There have been many views on the causes of this dispute. Further details in this report by colleague Ali Salim:

There has been a diversity of views on the causes of what reports have described as a sharp dispute inside Fatah, the biggest Palestinian group, which led to the creation of a new leadership led by Abu Salih [Nimr Salih] and including Colonel Abu Musa ['Abd al-Latif Jibarah], Abu Amjad, Abu Qadri, Abu Khalid al-'Amil and Mahdi Busaysu. Observers said that there is dissatisfaction among some of the leading elements of Fatah over the military and political line pursued by the leader of the organization since the withdrawal of the Palestinian resistance from Beirut last August.

This matter surfaced during the meetings of the Palestinian National Council in Algiers last February and in its discussions that confirmed the existence of this dispute between many Palestinian groups especially over the Reagan plan and the resolutions of the Fes summit. It also surfaced during the Palestinian-Jordanian talks that came to a halt later without an agreed formula for entering negotiations with the Zionist enemy being reached. In this context it is also possible to point to the murder of 'Isam as-Sartawi, political advisor to Chairman Yasir 'Arafat, which was claimed by the Abu Nidal group [Sabri al-Banna], and to the series of Palestinian statements opposing any form of capitulation or acceptance of any solution that does not achieve the aspirations of the Palestinian people and its independent state. On the other hand, some observers link this split and the Lebanese-Palestinian agreement expected to be signed in near future. The statement issued by Abu Salih accused Fatah of being ready to recognize the enemy and of working for the withdrawal of the Palestinian forces in the Al-Biqa' valley and north Lebanon. An informed Palestinian source has described the split as representing a revolution inside Fatah. The central Lebanese news agency confirmed that several armed clashes took place between Palestinian groups in the Al-Biqa' Valley and around Ba'albak. A PLO official spokesman, however, denied that such clashes took place and said that there are several problems and difficulties within the ranks of the movement in the Al-Biqa' Valley but that no bloody clashes have occured.

On another level, Yasir 'Arafat, PLO chairman, arrived on Friday in Damascus for a visit described by Palestinian sources as aimed at continuing his talks with senior Syrian officials on consolidating political and military coordination between Syria and the PLO. He also chaired several meetings of the PLO Executive Committee and the Supreme Military Council of the Palestinian revolution. Yasir 'Arafat for the second time inspected several positions of the Palestinian resistance in the Al-Biqa' valley in east Lebanon. Despite the mystery that to a great extent still surrounds developments inside the Palestinian quarters and especially Fatah, many observers are convinced that

something has happened inside Fatah at least. As an indication of this change, they point to the recent interview by 'Arafat in which he said that war is the only way to change the balance of power with the Zionist enemy.

More Officials Join Dissidents

LD161721 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] News dispatches from Al-Biqa' valley reported that the Palestinian revolutionary movement led by Abu Salih [Nimr Salih] has seized a mains arms depot in the region of Hammam Al-Biqa'. The dispatches explained that Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] ordered one of the officers, (Yahya Al-Hasan), to lead a unit to recapture the depot. However, the attempt failed.

On the other hand, Muhammad Abu al-Mayzar and his group have joined the movement. It has also been joined by the central intelligence body in Al-Biqa' Valley. In addition to this, all the Palestinians in Bulgaria and Moscow have joined the movement. They have also urged others to join the revolutionary movement. The Fatah women's organizations have announced that they are joining the movement. Abu Salih continues to reject any kind of mediation that the rightwing parties in the Fatah movement are trying to carry out.

Abu Salih has demanded an end to the situation throughthe convocation of a conference of the Fatah movement. He has stipulated that an emergency committee should be formed in the Fatah Central Committee. He has also demanded that the activities of all those who have met [word indistinct] parties, such as Abu 'Ammar, Abu Iyad [Salah Khalaf], Abu Mazin [Mahmud 'Abbas], and Khalid al-Hasan be suspended.

Fatah 'Revolutionary Movement' Statement

LD161244 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1005 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Beirut, 16 May (JANA) — The revolutionary movement within Fatah in the Al-Biqa' Valley, led by Abu Salin [Nimr Salih] and Abu Musa, issued a statement yesterday evening hailing the tremendous support it is meeting from fighters, units, and organs of all regions.

The statement says this support has deepened our faith in the belief that we are moving along the right course in protecting the Fatah movement, its unity and cohesion, and in firmly asserting its role as a vanguard of revolution, a guarantee for genuine national unity, and a stumbling block in the face of the imperialist-Zionist reactionary designs striking at the Palestinian revolution.

The statement declares the following:

1. Our action constitutes a correct start for imposing the will of the organized revolutionary base by way of an extraordinary conference, to be convened as soon as possible in order to rid Fatah of the rotten reality that we all know from which the movement is suffering and which permitted intruders to carry out their destructive, corruptive and divisive work.

2. Our action aims at making our movement the leading organization and not an organization of leaders.

3. Our action aims at implementing central democracy, particularly a collective leadership.

4. Our action aims at making the resolutions of the general congress the political line of the movement; they alone will be worthy of respect and implementation.

5. Our action aims at overthrowing the rule that enables the (?one) controlling the financial decisions to be in control of all decisions.

6. Our action aims at maintaining the independent Palestinian national decision. A strong, cohesive and fighting movement following a clear political line is the one that is capable of ensuring the independence of its decision; a weak, disjointed movement governed by one person, or by a few having no political line is not able to stand in the face of guardianship, dependency or containment.

7. Our action is aimed at restoring the respect of the Fedayeen who were the symbol for all that is bright, happy and honorable, and whose struggle, sacrifices and sufferings were drowned by those who were installed as leaders against their will: their prime concern was smuggling, speculation and trading in gold and silver.

8. Our action aims at achieving faithfulness to the sacrifices of our masses so that this faithfulness will become the required lever for their spirits in resuming the popular armed revolution as the only and inevitable way to liberation.

The statement calls on the fighters to stand by the side of the struggling Lebanon national forces who have decided to escalate their struggle to foil the agreement of shame with the Zionist enemy, and who say that now is the hour of uprising in the face of languor and negligence.

The statement makes clear that the movement has not fired a single shot in the 6 days of its existence because of its anxiety over every single drop of blood. It also stresses that the movement will never resort to violence whatever the reason.

Lebanese-Israeli Agreement Critically Assessed

PLO Leadership Rejects Accord

JN171226 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1215 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] The PLO Executive Committee, at its meeting in Damascus yesterday, reiterated its opposition and condemnation of the Lebanese-Israeli-U.S. agreement, stressing that the agreement is perilous to Lebanon's sovereignty and independence as well as to the Arabs' security, and harms Lebanon's commitments toward the Arab nation.

Reporting on the meeting, WAFA says that a delegation of the Lebanese Nationalist Movement including Lebanese Commu-

nist Party Secretary General George Hawi attended part of the Executive Committee meeting.

The PLO Executive Committee expressed its solidarity with the Lebanese Nationalist Movement and affirmed it will support all efforts to rescue the Lebanese people from the Israeli occupation and the U.S. plan that aims to impose U.S. hegemony over Lebanon and the Arab region.

Fatah Condemns Agreement

JN161113 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1100 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] In Damascus today, Fatah issued a statement in which it condemned the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement, adding that the agreement is meant to impose Israel's guardianship on Lebanon and its people. The agreement, Fatah stressed, would greatly harm Lebanon's future and security of the Arab nation.

Arab Silence Scored

JN142116 Baghdad Voice of PLO in Arabic 1625 GMT 14 May 83

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The Lebanese-Zionist agreement, which was drafted by the U.S. godfather, continues to provoke reactions that have transcended the region. This Lebanese-Zionist agreement, or the new Camp David agreement as it is being described by Arab newspapers, will affect not only Lebanon but the neighboring Arab states as well. It will carry with it potential dangers that will realize the Zionist enemy's ambition in the Arab land, and will lead to possible new agreement if the Arab situation remains as it is now. It seems as though recent Lebanese events are ordinary events that should not be given a moment's consideration.

The Lebanese-Zionist agreement implies official recognition of the Zionist enemy. It is a direct threat to the pan-Arab security because it was imposed on Lebanon by the U.S. Administration and its armed tool in the region, Israel. The agreement encroaches on Lebanon's sovereignty and independence because Israel will exploit it, through the presence of its troops in Lebanon and its liaison office in Beirut, as a means to dominate Lebanon and to help its agents, the rightist militias. The agreement is an official Lebanese involvement in dealing with Israel and is a violation of the Arab League Charter and the Arab summit resolutions that prohibit the recognition of any dealing with the racist Zionst entity that was established on the Palestinian Arab soil and that has been expanding and controlling other Arab lands.

These are obvious evidence of the seriousness of the Lebanese-Zionist agreement. What is more serious is the Arab silence on this agreement. Among all Arab capitals, only Damascus rejected the agreement. Syria has rejected the agreement. The PLO has rejected the agreement. We in the PLO have repeatedly warned against the intensive U.S.-supported Zionist efforts to impose military and economic control over one Arab state after another and to expand at the Arab states' expense. What happened to Egypt and to Lebanon will happen to other Arab states if the Arab position remains the same.

The alternative to the series of the humiliating agreements with the Zionist enemy is confrontation. This is the indespensable and only alternative we have. Our Zionist enemy, which has derived pleasure from the Arab humiliation and dismemberment, is preparing to pounce on new Arab capitals to impose agreements on them, and hence impose its policies, domination and expansion. The Arab phase of political dismemberment that was accompanied by a waste of all our efforts and all the means of Arab steadfastness and confrontation has whetted the appetite of the Zionist enemy and encouraged it to devour more Arab land and impose the Zionist faits accomplis, militarily, politically and economically.

The United States continues to give the Arabs false promises and is working with all its strength to support Zionist expansion and domination. As a prize for Israel's invasion of Lebanon and its rearrangement of Lebanese affairs to serve the U.S. strategy in the region, the Pentagon is consulting with U.S. industries to supply Israel with the necessary material to manufacture a new warplane for the Israeli air force. It seems as though the U.S. arsenal is not enough for Israel to carry out its aggression against the Arab nation.

We are certain that supplying Israel with the material to manufacture planes is withing the framework of the strategic cooperation between the U.S. Administration and the Zionist enemy; that the manufacturing and storing of planes is not to stage a military show. Other tasks have been prepared for the U.S. tool in the region, Israel. They are to be carried out against our Arab countries in order to make them surrender.

The region is currently witnessing belligerent U.S.-Zionist behavior. Time is running out. The Arab nation must make a decision and prepare for the confrontation. The United Sates has only given the Arabs false promises; Israel has nothing to offer except expansion.

What is our Arab nation waiting for? Is it waiting for a third Camp David?

'Silence Threatens Palestinian Issue'

JN161933 Baghdad Voice of PLO in Arabic 1630 GMT 16 May 83

[Political commentary]

[Text] Tomorrow, the Lebanese Government will sign the Israeli-Lebanese agreement, whose articles and results are already known. Tomorrow, the Lebanese Government will initial the agreement, despite the fact that it is an Arab government, a member of the Arab League, and committed to the Joint Arab Defense Pact. All this is taking place clearly and without any hesitation. This is the officially declared Lebanese position. What are the positions of the remaining Arab governments?

Until now, the Egyptian regime is the only one that has declared its position and said yes to the Lebanese-Israeli agreement. This is to be expected from a regime tied to the enemy entity through the Camp David accords. Until now, the governments that rejected the Camp David accords have remained silent while their media organs advocated and prepared for the Lebanese-Zionist agreement. What is strange and suspicious is the conflicting dual position of Arab governments.

The Arab governments adopted a historic decision that rejected Camp David — the establishement of peace with and recognition of the enemy and the normalization of relations with it. Hence, the Baghdad summit resolutions stipulated that the As-Sadat regime should be boycotted as long as it remains burdened with Camp David. This position, which we appreciate, stipulates that establishing peace with and recognizing the Zionist enemy relinquishes Arab sovereignty over Palestine just as it relinquishes national sovereignty for any Arab country to agree to establish peace with the common enemy and capitulate to its conditions, which stipulate, among other things, that Israel's security be guaranteed. This guarantee means, among other things, that the Arab government becomes a guard protecting the enemy borders. It also means that the enemy government has the right to ask that country to account for — in words or deeds — any political stand that demands commitment to the Arab stand.

If this is the position and understanding, why this suspicious silence while the Lebanese Government announces that it accepts the agreement and that it will sign it tomorrow? The Lebanese-Israeli agreement does not differ, as far as the results are concerned, from the Camp David accords. How can the Arabs, who rejected Camp David and boycotted the Egyptain regime in words, accept this agreement through their silence?

The Palestinian people and revolutionaries and the Lebanese people and revolutionaries are facing the bitter reality now as they live through a stage of overt official Arab capitualtion to the Zionists' conditions. They are living through a stage in which an Arab ruler says: I recognize the enemy, without fearing even a gentle reproach from his fellow rulers.

Our people and revolution, the people who fought the enemy throughout last summer in the south and in Beirut and the people who continue to confront the enemy in the occupied land despite the long years of occupation, our people and their revolutionaries who are continuing to fight the enemy are now asking the big question of everyone: What is your position on the Israeli-Lebanese agreement? Where is the Arab position on this agreement? Silence does not mean rejection, because silence is the position of those who accept and of the impotent. Our people, who are faced with a situation that has all the results of relinquishment and treason, can only accept absolutely clear positions. However, the official Arab media's contined presentation of the agreement as beautful and peaceful is very dangerous.

The conspiracy is now aimed at subduing the issue of Palestine in the Arab conscience and at extracting Palestine from Arab hearts. Yes, this is the only interpretation of the silence and attempts at beautification that the Arab individual is forced to swallow daily. We, the sons of Palestine, will not remain silent at this conspiracy. The Lebanese nationalist masses cannot possibly remain silent. The Lebanese-Israeli agreement is a new Camp David aimed at the Palestinian land, and silence threatens the Palestinian issue. Our blood alone awakened the world from a long, deep sleep. Our blood is capable of changing the big question into a big accusation. Palestinian blood has shaped the revolution and is now shaping the continued march until victory. The blood that has been shed like a waterfall since the glorious birth of the revolution will not stop flowing. This is the pledge of the revolutionaries of the Palestinian revolution to their people and nation. Our blood is much thicker than the ink with which treasonous agreements are signed.

U.S. Mideast Policy Unchanged

JN141457 Baghdad Voice of PLO in Arabic 1600 GMT 13 May 83

[Unattributed talk]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz' mission continues to cause discussion among observers in the Arab region, particularly about the Lebanese-Zionist draft agreement. Some people reacted to Shultz' tour and his achievement of the agreement, which is a just ink on paper, in a manner suggesting that the United States has future plans for solving the region's problems, including the Palestine question, which is the core of the conflict in this area. Are there some new and realistic ideas in Shultz' mission or in its details that could shed light on the new U.S. policy in the Middle East, particularly after the achievement of the Lebanese-Zionist agreement?

All the U.S. stands assert that the United States will never change its Middle East policy, which is based on complete support for the Zionist enemy and ignorance of the Palestinian rights and the PLO, which is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Shultz' tour was preceded by a U.S. campaign against the PLO and the Palestinian people. In fact, the U.S. campaign was a clear expression by the U.S. Administration and recognition, beyond its wish, of the role and importance of the PLO in any solution in the region.

We cannot trust or depend on any new U.S. moves in the Middle East. U.S. policy always serves Israeli interests to realize its ambitions in the occupied Palestinian lands, Lebanon, and the Arab region in general. U.S. policy in the region always views the situation with a Zionist eye.

Lebanese Urged To Resist

JN162007 Baghdad Voice of PLO in Arabic 1608 GMT 16 May 83

[Unattributed talk]

[Text] Masses of our Lebanese people, masses of the nationalist progressive movement in Lebanon: You may be aware of the dangers threatening Lebanon's unity, independence, and Arabism, particularly since Lebanon has always been known for its alertness to the Zionist danger, which threatens not only Lebanon but its Arab surroundings. The sons of Lebanon took up arms to defend the Palestinian revolution as well as Lebanon's

Arabism, unity, and independence. Thousands of Palestinians and Lebanese were martyred so Lebanon could continue to be a solid rock on which the Zionist ambitions will founder.

During the invasion of Lebanon and the siege of Beirut and up to this moment the sons of nationalist Lebanon have not put down their arms. On the contrary, they have tightened their grip on the nationalist fighting gun. The argument has always been that the occupation understands nothing but the language of power.

Today, after the United States has succeeded in forcing Lebanon to sign the humiliating agreement with the Zionist enemy, there is a plot to shackle Lebanon and isolate it from its Arab environment.

Our kinfolk in Lebanon, it is true that the Arab situation is filled with disappointment, feebleness, and weakness, yet the masses of Lebanon and Beirut who remained steadfast and together with the Palestinian masses resisted the siege and occupation, and who are still fighting the Zionist invaders, are capable — with their strength of will and unity with all fighting forces in Lebanon and elsewhere — of keeping the apparition of surrnder at bay and preventing its imposition on the Lebanese people. This surrender is intended to transform all Lebanese into people like Sa'd Haddad to guard the Zionist enemy and preserve its security at the expense of Lebanon's security, stability, unity, and Arabism.

Sons of valiant southern Lebanon, sons of Ma'ruf Sa'd and the mountain of 'Amil, brave sons of Ash-Shuf, sons of the lofty mountain of Lebanon, sons and grandsons of Kamal Junblatt: In order to prevent Lebanon from becoming a breeding ground for killer Zionists and a den for spies, you should resist this agreement of humiliation that is intended to transform Lebanon into a U.S. and Zionist arena. This is the most sacred duty for every nationalist Lebanese and free Arab.

The rich experience of the Lebanese nationalist movement and the rallying of the popular masses around this movement on resisting the Zionist invaders must be used all over Lebanon and must be translated into a rejection of and a resistance to all the agreements and plans that aim to Zionize Lebanon that the Zionist enemy and its agents are trying to bring about.

The entire Arab nation is looking forward to your efforts, sons of all Lebanon, to face the new plot that is now being hatched against this country in order to strip it of its Arab environment. This country is accustomed to coming out with surprises and heroic deeds that pay the Zionist enemy back twofold.

Jordan Rejects Appointment of PLO Official

JN161528 Jerusalem AL-QUDS in Arabic 2 May 83 p 1

[Text] The competent Jordanian authorities have, for security reasons, rejected the appointment of 'Izzat Abu ar-Rubb as the director of the PLO office in Amman.

Oman's Qabus Reportedly Meets Jordan's King Husayn

NC170644 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0635 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] Cairo, 17 May (MENA) — AL-AHRAM today reports that Sultan Qabus of Oman met with King Husayn of Jordan in the port of Al-'Aqabah after Sultan Qabus left Egypt 2 days ago aboard his yacht while passing through the Suez Canal on his return from a private European tour.

GULF AFFAIRS

UAE, Kuwaiti Foreign Ministers Leave for Tehran

GF161222 Abu Dhabi Domestic Service in Arabic 0930 GMT 16 May 83

[Excerpt] Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad as-Sabah, Kuwaiti deputy prime minister, foreign affairs minister, and information minister, and Rashid 'Abdallah, UAE foreign minister, left the UAE for Tehran today on the outset of a tour which also includes Iraq, with the aim of discussing ways of ending the Iraqi-Iranian war and combating the oil spill in the Gulf waters that originated from the Iranian Nowruz oilfield.

Al-Jabir Predeparture Statement

LD160911 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 0712 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Kuwait, 16 May (KUNA) — Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jabir, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, minister of foreign affairs, and minister of information, left the country at 0815 this morning on a political mission that includes visits to Tehran and Baghdad. The mission continues the efforts aimed at combatting the oil slick in Gulf waters and halting the flow from Iran's Nowruz wells.

Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad will stop over in Abu Dhabi to collect UAE Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Rashid 'Abdallah.

In a press statement before departure, Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad expressed his pleasure in accepting the invitation from the brothers in the Islamic Republic of Iran to visit Tehran. The topics for discussion with officials during the visit will, he said, be complementary to those held at the Regional Organization for Maritime Protection which was convened earlier in Kuwait, and which concentrated on finding the best means and ways to end the pollution problem.

Shaykh Sabah noted that this topic has not been finalized yet because certain points are still unresolved. Some parties to the talks consider these to be technical points while other consider them to be political.

Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad added that his mission during the visit will center on attempting to remove the obstacles from this road "so that we can reach the solution we aspire to and wish for... and in order to maintain the Gulf as a pure area devoid of any pollution."

The discussion, he said, will touch upon the political topics related to the oil slick. He also expressed pleasure because the visit will provide an opportunity to meet with Iranian officials with whom he has not met since the outbreak of the revolution. He said: "No doubt our meeting will have great value for the interests of the region...for we completely believe that the problems of the region must be solved by its states because they are the first concerned."

Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad repeated his thanks to the GCC countries "which have entrusted us with this task." He expressed hope that this mission will achieve all that is good for the Muslims and for the region's countries.

The deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, minister of foreign affairs and minister of information will head for Baghdad after his visit to Tehran.

He is accompanied by a delegation consisting of Director of his office Sulayman Majid ash-Shabin, General Secretary of the Committee for Cooperation With the Arab States of the Gulf Dr Salim Jabir al-Ahmad, and Counsellor at the Department of Economics 'Abdallah Sa'ud 'Abd ar-Razzaq.

He was seen off at the airport by Under Secretary of the Foreign Ministry Rashid ar-Rashid, Under Secretary of the Information Ministry Shaykh Nasir Mohammad al-Ahmad, Director of Protocol Taha al-'Ubaydi, and Iranian Charge d'Affaires Jawad Rizavi Imami.

BAHRAIN

Amir Meets With Libyan Envoy, Receives Message

GF161040 Manama WAKH in Arabic 0850 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Manama, 16 May (WAKH) — The amir of Bahrain, Shaykh 'Isa ibn Salman Al Khalifah, has received a letter from Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, pertaining to current developments in the Middle East region.

The letter was delivered by Kamil Hasan al-Maqhur, Libyan secretary of the General People's Committee for Petroleum, when he was received by the amir of Bahrain in Manama this morning. The audience was attended by Bahraini Prime Minister Shaykh Khalifah ibn Salman Al Khalifah, Foreign Minister Shaykh Muhammad ibn Mubarak Al Khalifah, Minister of Development and Industry and Acting Minister of State for Cabinet Affairs Yusuf Ash-Shirawi, and Director of the Libyan People's Bureau in Bahrain Ramadan ar-Ra'ubi.

Al-Maqhur arrived in Manama last night on a visit to Bahrain within the framework of his tour of a number of countries in the region.

Lebanese Envoy Arrives With Message 17 May

GF170642 Manama WAKH in Arabic 0600 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] Manama, 17 May (WAKH) — Lebanese Minister of Economy, Trade and Tourism Ibrahim Halawi, Lebanese President Amin al-Jumayyil's envoy, arrived in Manama from Doha this morning on an 1-day official visit to Bahrain. The Lebanese envoy is carrying a message from President Al-Jumayyil to Shaykh 'Isa ibn Salman Al Khalifah, the amir of Bahrain, pertaining to the Lebanese-Israeli agreement and Lebanon's stand on the situation in the Middle East region.

KUWAIT

Amir Receives Reagan Message on Gulf War

GF161428 Kuwait AL-QABAS in Arabic 15 May 83 p 1

[Excerpt] Yesterday the amir received a message from President Reagan which was conveyed by U.S. Ambassador to Kuwait Francois Dickman. The message contains the U.S. reply to his highness' message which dealt with international efforts to stop the Iraqi-Iranian war.

In his reply, President Reagan affirmed that the United States shares Kuwait's view on the need to do their utmost to halt hostilities and establish peace.

Qatari Heir Apparent To Visit 23-25 May

GF161620 Kuwait AS-SIYASAH in Arabic 15 May 83 P 1

[Exclusive report]

[Text] AS-SIYASAH has learned from official sources that His Highness Shaykh Hamad ibn Khalifah Al Thani, Qatari heir apparent and minister of defense, will pay an official 2-day visit to Kuwait in the last week of May in response to an invitation from his brother His Highness Sa'd al-'Abdallah as-Sabah, Kuwaiti heir apparent and prime minister.

Sources have stated that His Highness Shaykh Hamad ibn Khalifah, who will arrive in Kuwait leading an official delegation on 23 May, will meet with His Highness Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Jabir, the amir. Sources have further stated that his talks with His Highness Shaykh Sa'd al-'Abdallah as-Sahab, the heir apparent and prime minister, will deal with strengthening relations between the two fraternal countries in various fields and will also review the current situation in the Middle East, which is of mutual interest to the two countries.

OMAN

Iranian Hijacking Attempt Thwarted in Muscat

GF161332 Muscat Domestic Service in Arabic 1300 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] A spokesman for the Omani police has announced that an Iranian Air Force B-3 plane entered Omani airspace at 1300 today in a hijacking attempt that failed because the Omani authorities did not allow it to land.

The hijacker, Mohammad Hasan (Arjomandi), a 30-year old engineer in the Iranian Air Force parachuted from the plane at 1400 into one of the capital's suburbs. The aforementioned has been jailed on a charge of entering the country by force and illegally. The Iranian plane has returned to Iran.

QATAR

Lebanese Envoy Meets With Amir, Makes Statement

NC162322 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 2100 GMT 16 May 83

[Excerpts] The Arab Gulf has expressed its support for the Lebanese Government in its march for salvation. Following his visits to Kuwait and Abu Dhabi, Minister Ibrahim Halawah arrived in Qatar this evening, where he was received by Qatari Amir Shaykh Khalifah ibn Hamad Al Thani. The NATIONAL NEWS AGENCY correspondent has sent the following dispatch on Minister Halawah's visit to Doha — Minister Halawah will leave for Bahrain tomorrow, Tuesday, and from there to the Sultanate of Oman for the same purpose.

[Begin recording] Amir of the State of Qatar Shaykh Khalifah ibn Hamad Al Thani has announced his absolute support for Lebanon and for all the steps Lebanon may take to help it liberate its territory from foreign armies. He also announced his absolute support for the Lebanese-Israeli agreement out of his concern for Lebanon's sovereignty and independence. This came during a meeting between his highness the amir of Qatar and Lebanese President Amin al-Jumayyil's envoy, Minister Ibrahim Halawah, in the guest palace in Doha this evening.

Following the meeting, Minister Halawah went to the Al-Khalij Hotel, where he held a press conference during which he expounded on the agreement and answered newsmen's and Qatari Television reporters' questions.

He said: It interests me to note and praise his Highness Shaykh Khalifah ibn Hamad Al Thani's position. He expressed absolute support for and deep understanding of the Lebanese question. I am honored to (?praise) his highness' great stand. I maintain that the amir of Kuwait's and the UAE president's positions, so far, do not differ from that of the amir of the State of Qatar. They fully understand the Lebanese question and the dimensions of the agreement that we will sign with Israel. They have learned that this agreement does not harm Lebanon's relations with its Arab brothers and that it preserves Lebanon's independence and sovereignty throughout its territory.

When told that sources affirm that war will take place between Israel and Syria in Al-Biqa' and asked about Lebanon's stand on this, Minister Halawah said: We hope that war will not take place. We hope that this time the Arab mind will be different than the past. We also hope that Syria will realize that we are very concerned about and know its interests in Lebanon. We hope that we will cooperate together to end this ordeal from which we have been suffering for 8 years.

Asked about the government's stand on internal opposition, Minister Halawah said: I believe that this opposition does not constitute a large percentage of the Lebanese people. Lebanon is a democratic country and ensures freedom of speech. In Lebanon, every man has a right to oppose or support. I affirm that some of these people contact His Excellency President Al-Jumayyil and are in close touch with the government. I also affirm that they are under certain military pressure in known

areas in Lebanon, which so far, regrettably, are still not ruled by the legitimate Lebanese Government.

Asked about Lebanon's stand on the opposition to this agreement by certain Arab countries, Minister Halawah said: We did not feel any opposition except from sister Syria. We are determined to negotiate with Syria, and a committee has been formed to hold negotiations at the highest level. We hope to reach a solution with this sister country. [end recording]

SAUDI ARABIA

'More Positive' U.S. Stand on Palestinians Urged

LD171238 Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 1140 GMT 17 May 83

[Statement issued to SPA by Saudi Information Minister 'Ali Hasan ash-Sha'ir — date not given]

[Text] The Saudi Arabian Kingdom has followed with extreme concern the current developments in the region and has paid special attention to yesterday's decision made by the Lebanese Parliament.

While declaring its respect for the free will of the Lebanese people as manifested through their constitutional institutions and the exercise of their rights to regain their sovereignty and impose their authority over their entire land, Saudi Arabia wishes to stress its extreme anxiousness to affirm the need for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territories with the full guarantee of Lebanon's independence, Arab character, security, and stability.

The Arab world is today facing critical conditions that demand the intensification of efforts, the cohesion of ranks and the elimination of differences among the brothers so that a genuine Arab solidarity can be established alongside the international efforts that are being exerted for the establishment of a just and comprehensive peace in the region.

The relations between the two sister countries of Syria and Lebanon demand extreme attention from all the Arab countries so that fraternity, solidarity, and support may continue between the two Arab peoples.

The Saudi Arabian Kingdom looks for a clearer and more positive attitude from the United States to enable the Palestinian people to exercise their legitimate right to return to their homeland and to determine their own fate in their land. This can only be achieved through serious pressures on Israel to force it to withdraw from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967 as forming a basic step along the road to the desired solution.

Crown Prince Receives Libyan Envoy 16 May

LD161215 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1137 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Ad-Dammam, 16 May (SPA) — His Royal Highness Prince 'Abdallah ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, crown prince, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and commander of the National Guard, received at noon today in his office at the royal court the Libyan presidential envoy Ahmad Qadhaf ad-Dam.

Source Denies Prince To Meet FRG Officials

LD170941 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 0820 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] Riyadh, 17 May (SPA) — An official source has affirmed that the visit of Prince Sultan ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, second deputy prime minister and minister of defense and aviation, to West Germany is a private visit intended for treatment and recuperation and that there are no plans for any meetings between him and German officials.

The source was thus commenting on recent speculations that the prince will be holding official meetings with senior FRG Government officials.

UAE

Lebanese Envoy Briefs President on Agreement

NC161320 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1215 GMT 16 May 83

[Dispatch from Abu Dhabi by radio correspondent William ad-Dahir who is accompanying Economy, Trade and Tourism Minister Ibrahim Halawi on his Arab tour — live or recorded]

[Excerpts] United Arab Emirates President Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhayyan a short while ago affirmed his country's support for Lebanon's position and for President Shaykh Amin al-Jumayyil to end the occupation, and he expressed support for every step which Lebanon will take to liberate its territory. This affirmation came during the meeting which Shaykh Zayid held with Lebanese Minister Ibrahim Halawah, the special enovy of President Shaykh Amin al-Jumayyil. The meeting was attended by our ambassador in Abu Dhabi and Colonel Sa'id al-Qa'qur. The meeting lasted 45 minutes.

At the beginning of the meeting, Minister Halawah conveyed to the UAE president a message from President Shaykh Amin al-Jumayyil which, as we learned, contained thanks and appreciation for the UAE role and paid tribute to the relations between the countries. It was also learned that the message explained the substance of the agreement between Lebanon and Israel, the stages of the Lebanese crisis, and Lebanon's suffering for more than 8 years.

Halawah then presented a copy of the agreement to Shaykh Zayid, pointing out that there are parties trying to distort the real content of the agreement for reasons which are no secret to anyone. It has been learned that the conversation referred to the Soviet Union's entry into the Lebanese crisis as well as the Iranians, through their Revolution Guard, which is present in more than one area in Lebanon, particularly in Al-Biqa' and the north.

Minister Halawah stressed that the agreement safeguards Lebanon's sovereignty and does not affect its independence. He then

explained some articles, dispelling doubts cast by some parties that have certain ambitions and goals.

The Voice of Lebanon has also learned that UAE President Shaykh Zayid announced his country's support for Lebanon — president, government, and people — to end its suffering and to bring about the withdrawal of foreign forces from its territory, stressing that he will support any position which Lebanon and its president will find suitable to end this difficult ordeal. Shaykh Zayid said that only the sick person knows the illness is in his body, and no one can diagnose his illness better than himself. Sick Lebanon, in the UAE president's view, must eliminate its illness to regain its health and play its natural role in the area regardless of the obstacles and difficulties. We have also learned that the UAE president praised President al-Jumayyil's national and pan-Arab positions.

Departs Abu Dhabi 16 May

GF161846 Manama WAKH in Arabic 1735 GMT 16 May 83

[Excerpt] Abu Dhabi, 16 May (WAKH) — Dr Ibrahim Halawah, Lebanese minister of economy, trade, and tourism, left Abu Dhabi today following a short visit to the UAE within the framework of his tour of a number of the Arab Gulf states.

PDRY

Libyan Envoy Arrives in Aden With Message

GF161930 Aden Domestic Service in Arabic 1630 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Brother 'Abd al-Majid al-Qa'ud, secretary of the Libyan Atomic Energy Agency and personal envoy of Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the 1 September Revolution, arrived in Aden this evening on a short visit to the PDRY.

The Libyan envoy is carrying a written message to brother 'Ali Nasir Muhammad, secretary general of the YSP Central Committee, chairman of the Supreme People's Council Presidium,and chairman of the Council of Ministers, from his brother Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi.

In a statement to ANA, Brother Al-Qa'ud said the message deals with the crucial and serious situation the Arab nation is passing through and the situation in Lebanon in view of the imperialist-Zionist plots being hatched against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples.

He was received by Brother Dr Mutlaq 'Abdallah Hasan, Central Committee member and member of the Supreme People's Council Presidium; Brother 'Abd al-Wahid Fari', director of the Arab Homeland Department at the Foreign Ministry; and Brother Salim Muhammad Husayn, secretary general of the Libyan People's Bureau in Aden.

Mubarak Meets With Ministers, Businessmen

NC161808 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1730 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] President Muhammad Husni Mubarak convened a meeting today which was attended by Prime Minister Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din and the ministers of education, housing, electricity, planning, economy, investment, and industry. It was also attended by a group of Egyptian businessmen and some officials of the public sector.

Planning Minister Dr Kamal al-Janzuri said that the meeting dealt with the supply problems connected with the implementation of the private sector investments, the provision of lands in the new reclamation areas and of communications and energy and the removal of obstacles in the way of production in the public and private sectors and of the obstacles obstructing investments in the private sector.

Mubarak Sends Message To Romania's Ceausescu

NC170119 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2200 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Cairo, 16 May (MENA) — In its edition Tuesday the newspaper AL-AHRAM reports that President Husni Mubarak sent a message to Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu through Romanian Deputy Prime Minister Gheorghe Oprea, who concluded his visit to Egypt on the day before yesterday. The paper points out that in his message to the Romanian president, President Mubarak said that he is looking forward to President Ceausescu's visit to Egypt this year.

AL-AHRAM points out that deputy prime minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali will hold contacts with Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs Stefan Andrei to prepare for Ceausescu's visit to Cairo. The paper says that Prime Minister Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din will visit Bucharest in July to discuss aspects of bilateral cooperation.

Economic Protocol Signed With Romania

NC131612 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1400 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Cairo, 13 May (MENA) — An economic cooperation protocol between Egypt and Romania was signed in Cairo today at the end of the joint Egyptian-Romanian committee's meetings which lasted 2 days. The protocol provides for increasing the volume of trade between the two countries to $1 billion in 1985.

The protocol, which was signed for Egypt by minister of international investment and cooperation Dr Wajih Shindi and for Romania by Deputy Prime Minister for economic affairs Gheorghe Oprea, includes an agreement for promoting cooperation in the fields of industry, agriculture, housing and maritime transport.

In the industrial field, the protocol provides that Egypt and Romania will cooperate in developing the Hamrawayn phosphate, and caustic soda and sulphuric acid projects in Abu Za'bal as well as establishing a joint project for manufacturing equipment for train engines between the Simaf company and the Romanian Mecano export-import enterprise.

The Romanian side expressed readiness to cooperate with the Misr car company in assembling and producing tractors of various power.

In the field of agriculture, it has been agreed that the Romanian side will participate in establishing mechanized agricultural service stations and in providing Romanian expertise in the dairy products industry, in cheese produced from soya bean, in the sunflower oil industry as well as in cooperating in agricultural research fields.

In the housing and construction field, the Egyptian and the Romanian sides agreed to implement the potable water and sanitary drainage projects in Asyut governorate, which will cost 126 million Egyptian pounds. They also agreed to cooperate in the field of low cost housing construction for people with limited income.

In the maritime and railroad transport field, the two sides agreed to operate a joint shipping line between ports of the two countries to serve trade and transport equipment for joint projects.

The two sides will cooperate in exchanging and offering services and facilities to ships of the two sides in ports of the two countries. They will likewise cooperate in shipbuilding of up to [word indistinct] tonnage and will use Romanian expertise in this field.

The protocol also provides for increased cooperation in the field of supplying equipment for river transport ships, granting training courses for maritime transport workers and manufacturing air conditioned rail cars in Egypt.

The two sides agreed to increase the volume of trade between the two countries up to $1 billion by 1985. Egyptian exports will be diversified to include nonconventional goods in addition to cotton and oil.

The Egyptian side affirmed the importance of the Romanian side's commitment to import Egyptian phosphate in accordance with the agreement ratified between the two sides in January 1980 concerning the annual allocation of Egyptian phosphate until 1985.

'Ali Calls Lebanese-Israeli Agreement 'Important'

NC161406 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1348 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Cairo, 16 May (MENA) — Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali today said that the Lebanese-Israeli agreement is an important step along the path of a comprehensive Middle East settlement.

'Ali added: Egypt cares for Lebanon's sovereignty, security, unity, and territorial integrity and it supports the legitimate Lebanese Goverment. We want the withdrawal of all the foreign forces from Lebanon and the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty on every inch of Lebanese land. What concerns us is the stand of the legitimate Lebanese Government.

'Ali Supports OAU Conference at Addis Ababa

NC141818 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1730 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Mr Kamal Hasan 'Ali, the deputy prime minister and foreign minister, emphasized that the Arab Republic of Egypt agrees with the need to convene the African Summit conference on schedule in Addis Ababa on 6 June to enable the OAU to face up to its responsibility.

Mr Kamal Hasan 'Ali said that Egypt welcomes the raising of all topics at the conference so that it will become possible to resolve all the problems that are confronting the OAU.

He said: Egypt will clarify its position on all the African issues at this conference.

Ghali Interviewed on Middle East Issues

NC141420 Beirut MONDAY MORNING in English 8 May 83 pp 43, 44

[Interview with Egyptian Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Butrus Ghali by MONDAY MORNING correspondent Mona as-Said — date and place not given]

[Text] Question: In the light of Shultz's talks in Cairo, is it your impression that his current swing through area is designed to put the Lebanese house in order? To revive the Reagan plan? To urge the Arabs to drop the PLO? To contain Soviet influence in the area, particularly in Syria?

Answer: The visit of Mr. Shultz aims to promote the peaceful solution of the intricate problems of the Middle East. I would not say that the Reagan plan needs to be revived, as it is my view, especially after the talks I had last week in Washington and the talks I had in Cairo with the secretary of state, that this plan is still very much alive. But it needs new momentum to be able to overcome the various obstacles erected by Israel, and we believe that the prompt withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon can significantly contribute to that momentum.

As for putting the Lebanese house in order, we remain convinced that this can only be done by the Lebanese Government and the Lebanese people.

Question: Do you expect the American secretary of state to obtain an agreement on withdrawal of troops from Lebanon during his current tour?

Answer: The immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops is long overdue. It was demanded by Security Council Resolutions 507 and 508 almost a year ago, and it is high time Israel withdrew its troops. We hope that Mr. Shultz will be able to achieve progress.

Question: The impression after Shultz' talks with President Mubarak is that Cairo and Washington have no difference of opinion on the Lebanon issue and how it should be resolved. Would it be fair to assume, then, that both view Israel's terms for withdrawal as excessive?

Answer: I can speak only for Egypt, and Egypt considers that Israel's conditions for withdrawal are excessive, that Israel's attitude in the negotiations with Lebanon is unhelpful, intransigent and short-sighted.

Question: Though Washington has challenged the PLO's right to represent the Palestinians, you were quoted as saying in a television interview aired hours after Shultz's arrival in Cairo that there is no real Palestinian existence without the PLO. Have Egypt and the U.S. now closed the gap between them on the representative nature of the PLO?

Answer: It is a fact of life that the PLO exists, that it does represent the Palestinians and that it is in a position to play an essential part in the peace process. Egypt has always recognized that, and any objective analysis of the Middle East situation would lead to that conclusion.

The U.S., for political reasons, has not recognized the PLO until now and refuses to deal with it. The representative character of the PLO and its contributions to the peace process were brought up during our talks with Mr. Shultz. We reaffirmed to him our position that a real and just and lasting peace cannot prevail in the Middle East without the acquiescence of the PLO.

Question: Consultations are reportedly continuing uninterrupted between Egypt and the PLO. Has Shultz encouraged them, and have they led anywhere so far?

Answer: Consultations and talks between Egypt and the PLO have continued and will continue. They do not need to be encouraged or discouraged by anyone. It is up to Egypt, as a sovereign state, to decide when and where and with whom to consult and talk. Our aim from such talks is to contribute to the formulation of a just, comprehensive and lasting peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem.

Question: The PLO recently refused to accept Jordan as its representative in the proposed peace talks with Israel under the Reagan initiative. Is the alternative possibility of a PLO mandate to Egypt being explored?

Answer: The Reagan plan is based on the participation of Jordan and the Palestinians in the peace talks, and Egypt's view is that it would be a futile exercise to try to negotiate without the Jordanians and the Palestinians, to try to bypass them or impose on them solutions that would not be acceptable to them.

Question: Do you expect Shultz to obtain Israel's approval of a freeze on settlements during his current mission?

Answer: We do hope that the U.S. Government will be able to achieve the freezing of the settlements as soon as possible. This has been a constant aim of Egyptian diplomatic action since Camp David. We had even reached an understanding with the Israelis and the Americans on that matter, but the Israelis were not true to their word. We presented an official note to Cyrus Vance, the then secretary of state, on October 13th, 1978, requiring the freezing of the settlements; then again, we emphasized the importance of such a step in a note given to Sol Linowitz, the representative of President Carter, on October

13th, 1980; and the fact that we have not yet obtained the results we desire is no reason to lessen our determination or cease our efforts. The continuation of the establishment of the Israeli settlements can only indicate that Israel intends to impose new facts and goes against the very concept of autonomy and the rights of the Palestinians which even Israel recognized. The settlements are an unwarranted provocation and should be either dismantled or ceded to the Palestinians against financial compensation.

Question: The Soviet Union says Shultz' visit to the area is an attempt to split the Arabs and get the PLO "out of the game," and that it could lead to a new flare-up in the region. Do you find Moscow's view justified?

Answer: The aim of Mr Shultz's visit as I see it is to promote peace. We do not consider that injecting superpower rivalries and new cold war tactics into the already intricate problems of the area is helpful, and we hope to avoid that as much as possible.

Ghali Meets With UN Information Delegation

NC151845 Cairo MENA in English 1830 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] Cairo, May 15 (MENA) — State Minister for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali conferred here today with the UN information delegation, currently on a visit here, on preparations for the UN conference scheduled to be held on rights of the Palestinian people.

Dr Ghali explained the Egyptian diplomatic efforts to alleviate the suffering of the Palestinian people in the occupied Arab lands.

He also outlined Egypt's efforts to urge the world public opinion to adopt urgent steps to help the Palestinian people practise its legitimate rights, including its right to self-determination.

Dr Ghali further affirmed that Egypt is maintaining constant contact with the Palestinian command, the American administration and the Lebanese Government adding that these contacts are a positive element that serves peace efforts in the Middle East.

FRG Energy Experts Conclude Week-Long Visit

NC150831 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 0800 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] The FRG delegation of energy experts, led by Research and Technology Minister Heinz Riesenhuber, left Cairo this morning at the conclusion of a week-long visit to Egypt during which it held talks with Egyptian Government officials on strengthening the technical cooperation between the two countries in the fields of energy and electricity.

The delegation was seen off at the airport by Electricity and Energy Minister Mahir Abazah and electricity sector officials.

New Ambassador to Israel To Be Appointed

PM162259 Cairo OCTOBER in Arabic 15 May 83 p 1

[Unattributed report: "New Egyptian Ambassador to Israel"]

[Text] Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali has told OCTOBER that, after the peace treaty between Lebanon and Israel is ratified, Egypt will send its ambassador to Israel.

Among the candidates for the new post is Ambassador 'Umar Sirri.

Speaker Announces Nile Valley Parliament Members

NC160712 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1830 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Cairo, 16 May (MENA) — At the People's Assembly session this evening, Speaker Dr Sufi Abu Talib announced the names of the 30 Egyptian members of the Nile Valley Parliament. The following are the names of the Egyptian members of the Nile Valley Parliament:

Sayyid Zaki 'Abd al-Hadi, deputy speaker; Mukhtar 'Abd al-Hamid, deputy speaker; Adviser Ahmad (?Mursi), chairman of the Legislative and Constitutional Affairs Committee; Dr Muhammad Tulbah (?'Uwaydah), chairman of the Plan and Budget Committee; Fathallah Rif'at, chairman of the Economic Affairs Committee; Dr Muhammad 'Abd al-Ilah, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; Muhammad Hamid Mahmud, chairman of the Arab Affairs Committee; Kamal Henry Badir, chairman of the Defense, National Security and National Mobilization Committee; Mahmud Abu Wafiyah, chairman of the Proposals and Complaints Committee; Husayn Wishahi, chairman of the Manpower Committee; Engineer 'Abd al-Wahhab al-Habbak, chairman of the Industry and Energy Committee; Muhammad Mahdi Shuman, chairman of the Agriculture Committee; Dr Muhammad Kamil Laylah, chairman of the Education and Scientific Research Committee; Dr Muhammad 'Ali Mahjub, chairman of the Religious, Social, and Awqaf Affairs Committee; Dr Suhayr al-Qalamawi, chairman of the Culture, Information and Tourism Committee; Dr Hamdi as-Sayyid, chairman of the Health Affairs Committee; Engineer Muhyi ad-Din 'Abd al-Latif, chairman of the Transport and Communications Committee; Engineer Muhibb Istinu, chairman of the Housing and Utilities Committee; 'Abd al-Fattah ad-Dali, chairman of the Local Government Committee; and Sami 'Abdallah Abazah, chairman of the Youths Committee.

Dr Muhammad Ibrahim Dakruri, Salah at-Taruti, and Mustafa Muhammad Sulayman were chosen members of the General Committee for the National Democratic Party. Kamal ash-Shadhili is the representative of the parliamentary committee of the National Democratic Party and Ibrahim Shukri, the Labor Party leader, for his party. Dr Hilmi al-Hadidi was chosen as a member of the General Committee for independent members and Muhammad al-'Uqayli as representative of the parlaimentary group of the National Democratic Party in Qina. Shadhili Tawfiq was chosen as a representative of the parliamentary group of the National Democratic Party in al-Wadi al-Jadid.

Dr Sufi Abu Talib stated that when choosing members of the General Committee it was taken into consideration to choose representatives of the parties and independents and to complement the remaining number from among representatives of the parliamentary committees of the governorates adjacent to Sudan and which have human and organic links with Sudan, namely, the governorates of Aswan, Qina, the Red Sea and Al-Wadi al-Jadid. He added that the integration charter provides for forming the Nile Valley Parliament as follows: The speakers of the Egyptian and Sudanese People's Assemblies; a number of members of the Egyptian People's Assembly not exceeding 30 members and the same number from the Sudanese People's Assembly and the regional people's councils. The president of the republic shall appoint half of the remaining members numbering 30, who are qualified and interested in the affairs of integration between the two countries, for a renewable period of 2 years.

Dailies Urge Foreign Withdrawals From Lebanon

NC170705 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2218 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Cairo, 16 May (MENA) — In Tuesday's editorials the newspapers AL-AHRAM and AL-JUMHURIYAH focus on the reactions of the various parties concerned with the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, which is aimed at ousting all the foreign forces from Lebanon.

AL-AHRAM analyzes the various positions by the parties concerned with the agreement. It says that Israel is eager that its withdrawal be a sham and that its presence will be material and tangible even without armed forces. Syria wants to stay in the Al-Biqa' plain not only to compensate for the Golan but also to have it as a security belt beyond its borders, which is the same as Israel's pretext for being in southern Lebanon. AL-AHRAM adds that regarding the PLO, it naturally does not want to lose the last symbol of its presence in Lebanon.

AL-AHRAM calls for the need for strong external pressure to emphasize the idea of withdrawals by these parties, which lose nothing but win if they stay. The paper emphasizes that this pressure is, naturally, aimed at helping the legitimate Lebanese Government to liberate its territory and is consistent with the declared official Lebanese desire to restore complete sovereignty. The paper believes that this pressure must be represented in a joint strategy by the parties concerned that have an interest in the establishment of peace in Lebanon, such as using the card of aid by increasing or decreasing it. Saudi Arabia and the United States can play a role in this strategy.

Commenting on the same subject, AL-JUMHURIYAH describes Syria's reaction to the agreement when it was announced and when the Lebanese deputies approved it as upside down logic that prompts perplexity and surprise, particularly the statements made in Damascus which reject the agreement and affirm Syria will prevent its implementation.

The paper says that the Syrian stand contradicts official Syrian statements that previously affirmed the Syrian forces would withdraw from Lebanon if it was officially requested by the Lebanese Government. The paper says in this respect that there is no official or legitimate party more appropriate than the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies to approve the agreement, which provides for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon.

The paper believes that the Syrian rejection of this agreement only shows its desire to impose a trusteeship on a fraternal country and to exploit its people's pain and suffering for narrow self-interests. Concluding its editorial, the paper says that with this stand Syria has slain Lebanon twice: First by permitting itself to stay in Lebanon despite the Lebanese people's will, and second by depriving Lebanon of the opportunity to regain its land from Israel and achieve stability and security.

Opposition Paper Decries Government on Democracy

PM161338 Cairo AL-AHALI in Arabic 11 May 83 p 5

[Dr Fu'ad Mursi article: "Nationalizing the Opposition: Has the Countdown to Another September Begun?"]

[Excerpts] The recent campaign against the opposition has brought back the conditions or atmosphere of September 1981. The opposition press has been accused of "departing from the aim of free expression of opinion and indulging in shameful practices. The opposition parties and forces have been accused of "exceeding the limit, abusing rights, and failing to maintain a balance between rights and duties."

The time has come for us to discuss this unjust campaign to prevent a further worsening of the situation for everyone. I believe that we must question the government's concept of opposition. The government believes that the opposition has a particular role to play and that it must not exceed the limits of that role. We believe that this makes us a nationalized opposition owned by the state.

The secret of the government's attitude toward and erroneous and naive understanding of the opposition and its role lies in the government's concept of democracy to begin with. The government sees democracy as a government favor to the people. It does not say so, of course, but from time to time its statement expose this fact in one way or another. As-Sadat used to say it a lot. We recall his famous declaration: "I will not harm democracy." He said it as if he had a right to harm democracy but was forfeiting this right.

We fear that the countdown may have started. The freedom of opinion in the Bar Association — and even the association's legitimacy — were abolished by a law issued 2 days ago. Former state officials have been deprived of their freedom to write for 20 years by a law issued in a matter of hours. This means that freedom of opinion is again being abolished. This is in addition to the ban on movement which has been in force from the very beginning. The legislative machine has been used to legalize every ban on freedom.

In whose interest are matters being escalated and driven to the point of no return?

We know that an acute crisis is gripping the country. In particular, there is the economic crisis which, thanks to the policies of

the government and its party, appears to be insurmountable. Many forces at home and abroad have a vested interest in the continuation of the present state of affairs, if not in making it even worse. These forces are pressing and sounding the alarm against the people and against the opposition forces and parties. Their aim is further deterioration of the situation and flagrant resort to coercion, suppression of freedom, and disciplining or rather cancellation of the opposition. They claim that this would make the people an easier tool in the hands of the government.

We do not want to preach and guide here and we do not want to recall what happened on 6 October 1981. We just want to say two things. The first is that we are not in a competition to achieve the worse. We are striving to the best of our ability for reform and salvation. The second is: One bitten twice shy. This applies to you as well as to us.

Communique on 15-16 May War Operations

JN161619 Baghdad Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 16 May 83

[Communique No. 1,093 issued by the Iraqi Armed Forces General Command on 16 May 1983]

[Text] In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate.

The valiant soldiers of Saddam's Al-Qadisiyah are continuing their successful activities against the aggressive Iranian forces. The results for yesterday evening and today are as follows:

1. Our forward units pounded the enemy positions and troop concentrations opposite our positions in the Maysan sector, killing three and destroying two vehicles — one of them carrying a 106-mm gun — and one infantry position.

2. Two were killed, others wounded, and two vehicles destroyed in the northern sector of the battlefield.

3. Three Iranian soldiers sought refuge with our forward units in the Maysan sector the day before yesterday, running away from the hell of the suspect Khomeynite regime. They were evacuated to the rear in complete safety.

4. Today the vile Iranian regime shelled Basra, Khanaqin, their outskirts, and Zurbatiyah, damaging some civilian establishments.

[Signed] The Armed Forces General Command, 16 May 1983

Commentary Criticizes Tehran, Damascus, Tripoli

GF170730 Baghdad International Service in Azeri 1800 GMT 16 May 83

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, after threatening Iraq's [word indistinct] and independence — a move which has resulted in the death of over 4,000 Iranian youths in the (Shush), Fakkeh and [name indistinct] regions in Iraq, Hashemi-Rafsanjani, the midget fascist of the Jamaran court and the active agent of imperialist and Zionist circles, withdrew into silence. It will be recalled that after making numerous nonsensical remarks, Rafsanjani, who is the speaker of the Majlis and the official spokesman of the Supreme Defense Council, moved to test his luck and that of impostor Khomeyni and his imperialist patrons within Iraqi territory. However, apart from (?converting Iran into a new bloodbath) and bringing more disaster upon Iranians, he achieved nothing at all.

Irrespective of all this, [words indistinct] Rafsanjani made it known with (?nonsensical) and empty remarks a few days ago that the Khomeyni forces will not abandon their consecutive marches and continue testing their (?strength) within Iraq. They will test their strength within Iraq at the expense of Iranian blood. This is described in the language of the people as [words indistinct].

Iranian Armed Forces and Iranian peoples, O Azarbayjan, Kordestan, Ahvaz and Torkaman (Sahra), O poor Muslim peoples of Iran, are you not aware that by resorting to a new move, the [word indistinct] of our time and impostor Khomeyni wishes to convert tens of thousands of Iranian youths into (?cannon fodder)? If you are not, then realize the fact that Khomeyni, Khamene'i, Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Musavi-Ardabili, Mir Hoseyn Musavi and others wish to (?destroy) the fire of Iran [Iranian Army] through such [word indistinct] marches and consecutive (?onslaughts). This is the sole objective behind Khomeyni's insistence on prolonging the war. They wish to replace the fire of Iran with the murderous and criminal Revolution Guards Corps.

It will be recalled that Khomeyni sent a message to the (?peace-loving) people of Basra calling on them to rise against the central government. Meanwhile, the eastern sector of Basra became the target of consecutive attacks launched by the Khomeyni forces — attacks which have resulted in the deaths of tens of thousands of Iranians (?who followed) impostor Khomeyni.

Regardless of this however, Khomeyni and his sinful band failed to abandon their deceitful activities. They moved to test their strength in the Maysan and Mandali regions as well. But what have they achieved by all this?

This question must be answered by the [word indistinct] rulers in Damascus and Tripoli — that is to say by Hafiz al-Asad and Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi and other despicable people like them whose hands are stained with blood. This question must be answered by the [word indistinct] and fascistic rulers in Tehran and Qom — rulers who wish to fish in troubled waters. It must be answered by Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Sayyad-Shirazi, Mohsen Reza'i, and others. It must be answered by the (?infidels) in Qom like Montazeri, Khalkhali,and (Suad) Karimi. This is due to the fact that all the above-mentioned people are directly responsible for the prolongation of the war and for the deaths of tens of thousands of Iranians. And in view of this, they must account to the Iranian peoples.

King Sends Letter to U.S. Arabs Conference

JN151037 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0500 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] Washington — His Majesty King Husayn has said that Israel's endeavor to achieve control and hegemony in our region is unlimited and that its obstinate concept of security, as well as its strategy for the 80's, are based not simply on destroying the Palestinian Arab people's presence, but on disintegrating the Arab nation into tribes, ethnic, and religious groups that fight among themselves.

In a letter addressed to the annual conference of the National Association of Arab-Americans now convening in W hington and read today on his majesty's behalf by Crown P nce Hasan, the king said that it is fair to stress that the road from the 1967 Khartoum Arab summit conference to Khaldah, one of the locations of the recent negotiations in Lebanon, has been rich with wasted opportunities, due, to a large extent, to Israeli intransigence. In this regard, his majesty reviewed the international efforts and resolutions to bring about peace in the Middle East, outlining that Israel was and still is the real obstacle that has prevented and is still preventing the achievement of peace. It is Israel's intransigent policies, that are based on groundless beliefs, that do not serve the world's peace and security.

His majesty said that the provisions of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 have given Israel recognition and security within its boundaries provided that the Arabs occupied territories, including occupied Jerusalem, are restored. Israel, however, refused to respond. We see that the Israeli leaders are tightening up their control over the West Bank, claiming that it is an integral part of Eretz Yisra'el according to feeble Torah pretexts. It is possible, therefore, that they invent similar claims regarding the invasion of the Golan Heights.

His majesty asserted that if the issue of Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon is hindered then those defending Israel will not be able to continue their claims that Israel wants to live in peace with its Arab neighbors. They do not realize that by its military annexation of the land, Israel indicates that it refuses to coexist with its neighbors unless coexistence is according to Israeli conditions.

His Majesty King Husayn outlined the prompt efforts Jordan has made on all levels to preserve the Palestinian rights and establish peace in the region, stressing that this is due to the common destiny of the Jordanian and Palestinian peoples throughout their long history. He stressed that Jordan will continue its efforts to achieve a just and durable settlement in the Middle East.

He said that although the Lebanese issue is important, its solution must not be considered as the ultimate end, but rather a means to achieve a comprehensive settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

His majesty added that we in Jordan believe that the spirit of the Reagan plan and the Fes peace plan draw up broad lines within which a just and durable settlement must be reached in the Middle East region. In his letter, his majesty tackled the march of the Jordanian-Palestinian relationship, which was besed on the joining of two distinct entities within the framework of one state in 1950 when the unity of the two banks of Jordan came about after the Palestinians had exercised their right to self-determination. The Jordanian parliament, which was then representing both banks, made it clear that unity does not mean the relinquishment of Arab rights and claims in Palestine pending a final and comprehensive settlement to the conflict. He stressed that Jordan has shouldered a great responsibility toward the Arabs of Palestine out of its feelings for national and pan-Arab duties.

His majesty explained Israel's inhuman practices against the Palestinian Arab people and its continued attempts to deprive this people of their identity, annex their land, and evacuate the people from the land using aggressive methods within the framework of Israel's policy to implement the alternative homeland plot. His majesty indicated that the people needing urgent protection are the Palestinians suffering from the yoke of Zionist occupation.

His majesty said that after its occupation of the Arab land in 1967, Israel disavowed the Palestinians' right to self-determination. The Israeli leaders intended to raise the slogan of the alternative homeland as a reaction to the international recognition of Palestinian rights. Referring to the slogan raised by Zionist extremists that Jordan is Palestine and the homeland of the Palestinians, his majesty said that the Palestinians refuse this because they have their own homeland which cannot be confused with Jordan. He stressed that throughout history, Jordan has been an entity distinguished from Palestine in various areas.

Concluding his letter, His Majesty King Husayn invited the members of the Senate and Congress who are concerned with the achievement of peace in the Middle East to visit Jordan and acquaint themselves with the realities of the situation and share the joint responsibility of making a durable peace in the Middle East a reality, stressing that the time element is essential.

Crown Prince Hasan was the main speaker at a large ceremony that began at midnight, local Jordan time, and attended by hundreds of Arab Americans, a number of Senate and Congress members, politicians, and other persons concerned with Middle East affairs. The crown prince earlier met with the administration board of the Arab Americans' Association, which is considered the main political Arab lobby in the United States. The two sides had extensive discussions on U.S.-Arab relations and the Arab causes in U.S. policies, particularly the Middle East issue.

His highness then attended a reception in his honor at the association's center. Crown Prince Hasan arrived in Washington on Thursday evening on a private visit during which he will deliver on behalf of King Husayn the main speech at the 11th annual conference of the National Association of American Arabs which is convening under the slogan "The United States and the Arab World are Partners for Peace." Some 1,500 Arab Americansare participating in this conference which began Thursday and will be concluded today. A number of Americans concerned with Arab affairs are also attending. The meetings have included political and cultural seminars as well as speeches dealing with Arab-U.S. relations and Arab affairs in the U.S. arena.

On Friday, the crown prince received at his place of residence in Washington former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and former Congressman Paul Findley. Present at the two meetings was Minister of Court 'Amir Khammash.

Dailies View Syrian Rejection of Agreement
JN140850 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0500 GMT 14 May 83

[From the press review]

[Text] Under the headline "The Lebanese-Israeli Agreement," AR-RA'Y says: After Syria officially announced its rejection of the withdrawal agreement between Lebanon and Israel, a question must be asked regarding the point which the Syrian rejection must not overstep. The questions and answers will reveal facts that must be taken into consideration. The most important fact is that this agreement was not the best Lebanon could hope for but merely the best it could achieve in view of the current circumstances in the region and the obvious Arab circumstances.

This means that the Lebanese negotiator assessed the priorities and chose the preservation of Lebanon's unity and the withdrawal of non-Lebanese forces from his territory after also having evaluated the disadvantages [of the agreement] and had no choice but to accept part of them.

AR-RA'Y adds: Thus, it would be an exaggeration to describe the agreement as a brilliant victory for Lebanon. It would also be wrong to accuse the Lebanese negotiator of appeasement. The agreement can best be described as a necessity dictated by the absence of a positive alternative to achieve complete and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. It is not a secret that from the beginning, Lebanon's dilemma was not isolated from Arab circumstances. Perhaps these circumstances were the most prominent factors that have affected this dilemma and its repercussions so far. Also, it is no secret that Arab circumstances have not improved. In light of this fact, the assessment of the necessity represented by the agreement is primarily Lebanon's responsibility because, first, it is the party that has suffered most from Israeli occupation, and second, no one has offered it a real alternative to the agreement.

AR-RA'Y adds: It is true that Syria's opposition to the agreement is not intended to keep the Israeli forces in Lebanon. However, Syrian opposition is the basic factor which Israel would use as an excuse to keep its forces there if such opposition was accompanied by an interpretation represented in Syria's refusal to withdraw its forces from Lebanon. Even if Syria has a right to announce its position on the agreement, however, it has no right to dictate this position to Lebanon's legitimate authority and no right to behave in a way that would provide Israel with an excuse for keeping its forces there.

Under the headline "The Lebanese Dilemma," AD-DUSTUR says: The Lebanese foreign minister said that his country was in a dire dilemma and called on the Arab nation and the world to extend all possible assistance to rescue Lebanon from this dilemma. In Washington, the White House affirmed that the United States would continue to urge Damascus to withdraw its forces from Lebanon. A Lebanese source indicated that Syria did not make any specific demand of Lebanon or the United States. This source added that Syria will not withdraw its forces from Lebanon until it receives U.S. guarantees and commitments regarding Israeli withdrawal from the Syrian [Golan] Heights.

These statements represent important indicators that the Lebanese issue cannot be separated from the Middle East crisis as a whole, and that the search for peace and justice will continue to be futile as long as it is does not take the basics of the issue into consideration, which are, briefly, the Israeli occupation of Arab territories.

Therefore, it is not objective to consider the Lebanese- Israeli agreement as a very important acheivement because the Israeli occupation of Lebanon is a consequence of Israeli occupation of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, and the Syrian heights. Tackling consequences without tackling their causes will not achieve justice or permanent and honorable peace.

AD-DUSTUR adds: We believe that the United States is required to do more than just urge Damascus to withdraw its forces from Lebanon. In order to carry out this bigger, deeper role, it must approach Damascus with a serious, sincere initiative to convince it that the Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon is the beginning of a road leading to a just and permanent peace based on Israel's acceptance of international resolutions, values, and principles, foremost among them the world's refusal to allow forcible seizure and occupation of other people's land.

AD-DUSTUR concludes: Lebanon faces a great dilemma, as confirmed by its foreign minister. The signing of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement cannot be a way out of this dilemma if the United States and Israel do not respect international legitimacy and UN resolutions regarding the Middle East, particularly those pertaining to the Palestinian issue.

Even if we oppose the internationalization of the conflict in the region in a manner that only benefits international sides, we do not oppose the internationalization of sincere efforts that are aimed at achieving just peace. Principles and values do not belong to one party alone, and resolutions pertaining to the Middle East are based on a resolute determination to uphold international legitimacy, which cannot be implemented through one party alone in the process. By not believing in these facts, everything in Lebanon, and the whole of the Middle East, will remain as it is mere efforts that will not defuse the situation, establish a truce, or lay the foundation for peace, justice, and security, but will only delay the explosion.

Weinberger's Warning to Syria, USSR Reported
JN141940 Amman Domestic Television Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger today warned the USSR and Syria that any intervention by them in Lebanon to hinder the Lebanese-Israeli agreement will be met with appropriate retaliatory operations and will increase the threat of a new war in the region.

In a speech in Washington today, Weinberger added that the Soviet position creates obstacles in the efforts to realize the withdrawal of foreign forces from Lebanon. He said that what he called retaliatory action will make those who interfere in Lebanon lose any hope of benefiting from their opposition. He expressed hope that Syria will realize that it is in its interest to agree to withdraw it forces from Lebanon.

This the first time that a senior U.S. official has issued such a warning.

Weinberger also said that the USSR is making a great and serious mistake if its thinks that by sabotaging the peace process in Lebanon it will be able to force the United States to relinquish its commitment in the region.

Weinberger described the fact that Lebanon and Israel have agreed that the Israeli forces will withdraw if the Syrian and Palestinian forces withdraw as an important step toward peace in the Middle East.

Prince Hasan Meets Reagan, Advisers 16 May

JN161908 Amman Domestic Television Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] U.S. President Ronald Reagan received in the White House today Crown Prince Hasan along with a message from His Majesty King Husayn on the situation in Lebanon.

His highness reviewed Jordan's unswerving stand on the Arab cause, and particularly on the Palestinian people's legitimate rights, their Arab identity, Jordan's pan-Arab commitment to support the steadfastness of the kinfolk in the occupied territories, and its adherence to the UN resolutions that call for settling the Middle East crisis in a just and comprehensive manner that safeguards Arab rights.

The meeting was attended by U.S. Vice President George Bush; Secretary of State George Shultz; William Clark, assistant to the President for national security affairs; Edwin Meese, counselor to the President; and Nicholas Veliotes, assistant secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian affairs.

After his meeting with President Reagan, Crown Prince Hasan told the press that achieving a solution in Lebanon must be accompanied by talks on the Arab territories, including occupied Jerusalem and the fate of the Palestinian people.

His highness reiterated Jordan's support for Lebanon in its efforts to regain sovereignty over all its territory.

Grants Television Interview

JN161951 Amman Domestic Television Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] In a television interview on the Cable News Network, His Highness Crown Prince Hasan expressed Jordan's fear that the Middle East will become a region of international polarization and confrontation between the USSR and the United States, whereby the country which is an ally to either of them will benefit.

His highness believes that the USSR is not interested in an outbreak of fighting in the Middle East, despite the fact that it increased its military activities in Syria.

His Highness Crown Prince Hasan said he hoped that Syria would, in the end, accept the agreement reached between Lebanon and Israel on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. His highness added that it would be difficult for the Syrians to immediately change their position. He added: I believe that the Syrian commitment to averting another comprehensive war in the region is as sincere as that of any other party. Therefore, there is still hope.

His highness Crown Prince Hasan added: The possibility of confrontation between the superpowers in the Middle East is one of the more serious developments in the region. He said: I believe that at this stage, the USSR is not interested in a confrontation in the Middle East or in any other part of the world.

Regarding President Reagan's initiative, His Highness Crown Prince Hasan said that Jordan welcomed it. He added: Despite the fact that this initiative is incomplete, it provides a new momentum to peace in the region. The USSR is displeased at being excluded from the peace process and Moscow can contribute to achieving stability in the region.

Moroccan Delegation Arrives in Amman 15 May

JN151530 Amman PETRA-JNA in Arabic 1430 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] Amman, 15 May (PETRA) — Dey Ould Sidi Baba, speaker of the Moroccan Chamber of Representatives and chairman of the Arab Parliamentary Union [APU], arrived here today at the head of a delegation comprising seven representatives on a visit to Jordan during which he will convey a message to His Majesty King Husayn from His Majesty King Hassan II.

The speaker of the Moroccan Chamber of Representatives said that he would discuss with Jordanian officials a number of issues to be dealt with during the APU conference scheduled to be held in Baghdad the day after tomorrow. The visit came at the invitation of Senate President Ahmad at-Tarawneh. The Moroccan Chamber of Representatives delegation is due to leave for Baghdad later this week to participate in the APU conference.

Delivers Message to Husayn

JN161649 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] His Majesty King Husayn received a message from King Hassan II of Morocco. The message was delivered to his majesty by Dey Ould Sidi Baba, speaker of the Moroccan Chamber of Representatives, when he was received by His Majesty King Husayn at An-Nadwah Palace this afternoon.

The message, which comes within the framework of constant consultations and coordination between their majesties, evaluates the current Arab situation, the latest developments in the region, and bilateral relations.

The meeting was attended by Senate President Ahmad at-Tarawinah and the Moroccan ambassador in Amman.

Chinese Delegation Arrives in Amman 14 May

JN141752 Amman PETRA-JNA in Arabic 1440 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Amman, 14 May (PETRA) — A Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference delegation arrived in Amman this morning on a 5-day visit to Jordan during which it will meet with senior Jordanian officials and visit a number of tourist and cultural sites. The delegation includes four National Committee members led by ChengZihua, the vice chairman of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference and an adviser at the Ministry of Civil Affairs. Sulayman 'Arar, National Consultative Council speaker, and several council members met the delegation at Amman airport.

Speakers Receives Delegation

JN151818 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] National Consultative Council [NCC] Speaker Sulayman 'Arar has said that the military and political situation imposed by Israeli presence in the Arab region gives us reason for concern over our present and future. He stressed that this has cost us dearly at the expense of domestic development.

Speaking during his meeting today with the head and members of the delegation of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference [CPPCC] currently visiting Jordan, 'Arar said: We are experiencing economic and social problems like all peoples of the Third World countries, but our ambitions to change this situation, to which colonialism has contributed, are big and encouraging.

'Arar affirmed Jordan's adherence to a just peace based on respecting the rights of peoples in the region and rejecting the fait accompli policy that Israel is trying to entrench in the region.

The NCC speaker lauded the experience of the Chinese people and the position of the Chinese Government on the just issues of the Arab nation. He said: We appreciate those stands which support Arab rights.

Cheng Zihua, head of the delegation, replied in a speech in which he lauded the standard reached by Jordan in all fields. He said: We understand Jordan's suffering in its confrontation with the Israeli enemy, which threatens Jordanian security and stability.

The head of the Chinese delegation asserted that the Chinese Government supports Arab issues and said: We will stand by the Arab nation in its just issues, especially the Palestine question.

At the end of this meeting a general discussion took place between the members of the Jordanian and Chinese delegations on the major issues of the region and their developments.

Senate speaker Ahmad at-Tarawinah also received the CPPCC delegation headed by Cheng Zihua and explained to them the nature of the current situation in the region. The discussion dealt with the position of the Chinese Government on just Arab issues.

Delegations Arrive in Khaldah To Sign Accord
NC170654 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 0633 GMT 17 May 83

[Report by Lebanese Information Ministry mission from Lebanon Beach Hotel in Khaldah — live]

[Text] This is the first dispatch by the Lebanese Information Ministry mission at the Lebanon Beach Hotel in Khaldah, where the Lebanese-Israeli draft accord is expected to be signed. Strict security measures have been adopted in the hotel area, but these measures are not affecting the noticeably calm atmosphere. Some members of the Israeli delegation arrived at 0750 in a helicopter. Some members of the U.S. delegation, including Christopher Ross, arrived at 0720. A few minutes ago Ambassador Draper and other members of the U.S. delegation arrived. Ambassador Fattal and members of the Lebanese delegation have also arrived. Speaking about the signing ceremony, sources here say that the Arabic and French texts of the draft accord will be signed here in Khaldah while the English and Hebrew texts will be signed in Qiryat Shemona later today. The delegations are expected to move to Qiryat Shemona at midday.

Fattal Speech at Khaldah Signing Ceremony
NC170950 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 0736 GMT 17 May 83

[Speech by Ambassador Antoine Fattal, head of Lebanese delegation, at Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement signing ceremony in Khaldah, delivered in French, processed from English translation — live]

[Text] [Words indistinct] Ambassador, the agreement which I have the honor to sign today in the name of the Government of the Republic of Lebanon aims fundamentally at ending 8 years of war and anarchy. Its objective is to ensure the withdrawal from Lebanon of all foreign forces which at different times and for various reasons entered our territory.

To everything there is a season and a time for every purpose under the heavens, says the book of Ecclesiastes. Isn't it time we put some order in our own country? Since April 13, 1975, Lebanon has been more than once nearly engulfed by the storm. Even the ruins died, exclaimed Lucan when he saw what was left of Troy. And paraphrasing the poet we could say that even the ruins died in Lebanon. Events have taught us that our country, however beautiful, however beloved is not an absolute but an earthly creation liable to be destroyed. Nothing is more fragile than a country. Very often its span of life is no longer than that of a human being. States, just as civilizations, can perish, and they often perish because of man.

In the words of Simone Weil, a country must be loved with a simple and dignified love made of compassion, care, and watchfulness; such is our love for Lebanon. The only true and just love, a love which encompasses in one glance love of our coasts, our plains, each terrace carved in the rocks by our forefathers, each particle of this soil which our fathers tilled before being laid down in it. This land we love with all our heart, with all our soul, and all our strength is the betrothed of the Song of Songs. We have no intention of sharing it with anyone.

If we are signing this agreement with you, it is also because Lebanon has a pressing need for calm and order. Its very survival is at stake. In security, a state of war, even a mere war of nerves, jeopardize any undertaking. This is why Lebanon must have a clear notion, in which sentimentality enters as little as possible, of its duty of solidarity towards the region and the world. It must adopt a discreet, flexible and tolerant policy and the diplomacy the rule of which is to be neither static nor predominant but complementary.

Lebanon intends to maintain the community of interests [word indistinct] for its neighbors. A small country of some 10,000 square kilometers with a limited potential, it seeks neither glory nor grandeur. It cannot pride itself on what is won in the battlefield. Having lived without potential, it wants to go on living far from provocations, storms, and the rattle of arms. While others might thrive on [word indistinct] competition, Lebanon would be ruined by them. Moderation is a cardinal virtue for Lebanon — one of the bases of its existence. Lebanon intends to restore and reestablish a strong current of solid friendship between the members of its mosaic of 17 communities — Christian, Muslim, and Jewish — a mosaic which subversion attempted to (sever?) by all means. Their customs, temperaments, and ways might vary, but Lebanon, far from trying to level the differences, has set itself as the guardian of their diversity in so far as its common finality is (?steeped) with (?an order) and justice.

Lebanon intends to remain faithful to its Arab vocation in spite of its hazards while ending the state of war with Israel. There is no contradiction there. Because of the human and religious geography, the other Arab states have a monolithic character which determines their conduct and channels it in directions which a diversified and pluralist country such as Lebanon cannot follow. Inter-Arab solidarity in no way impels Lebanon to stop its neighbors' behavior.

The Arab world to which Lebanon belongs can be compared to a tree. As the tree grows, its branches spread apart and become different. Some turn toward the rising sun, others turn south and others have to fight the northern wind. They don't seem to know each other since each one is oriented differently, yet they all belong to the same tree trunk from which they draw their sap, [words indistinct]. Separated from it they die. The nobility of a tree resides in the plasticity of its form. We are not [words indistinct] of uniformity [words indistinct].

The agreement we are signing today is not a peace agreement. It, I quote, is not a peace agreement, it is a step toward a just and lasting peace. End of quotation. I borrowed that expression from the disengagement agreement made on 31 May 1974 between Syria and Israel. If we accept it in its [words indistinct] it is not only to free our country from the burden of occupation, nor is it only because we need peace and security. We too love liberty. We loathe any servitude.

The Lebanese are mountain people and Montesquieu notes that in mountainous countries there is little to [word indistinct]. Only liberty is worth fighting for and we shall fight for it.

It has been said this agreement is not perfect. I would say it is reasonable. Perfection belongs to God only. Reason had to prevail over the passions which caused us so much suffering. There is something more than [words indistinct] with such a strength that there is no room left for doubt. We want to be artisans of peace. In a few days this agreement will enter into force. The Lebanese and Israelis will have to show a great sense of responsibility to ensure its implementation and to overcome the obstacles which are already appearing in the distance.

Before concluding, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Ambassadors Kimche and Draper for their intelligence, [word indistinct] and ability they have always shown throughout the 5 months of difficult conversations.

I also wish to pay a tribute to the United States of America, to their President and to their representatives, present or absent, whose friendship and cooperation were so effective.

In the name of the Government of the Republic of Lebanon, I wish to express to them our heartfelt gratitude, and finally I wish to thank all those who have cooperated with us in this difficult task.

Salim Delivers Government Statement 16 May
NC161944 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1702 GMT 16 May 83

[Government statement on Lebanese agreement with Israel delivered by Foreign Minister Dr Elie Salim at Chamber of Deputies session on 16 May — recorded]

[Text] Your excellency the prime minister, honorable deputies: We appear before you today when Lebanon is about to cross the most delicate and serious stage in its modern history. It is the stage of survival and permanence or of dispersion and extinction. It cannot cross this difficult stage without your backing and support for the steps which we have taken and the correct stands which we have adopted.

At this decisive moment we are called upon to abandon all marginal considerations and to give the highest consideration to the fate of Lebanon and the right of its people to live in dignity after years of coercion, fear, and ruination.

In today's statement I do not address myself to your emotions but to your conscience because you are the conscience of the nation and I address myself to your minds because you have crystallized the unity of Lebanon and its steadfastness.

The draft agreement presented to you secures for Lebanon the independence and security it lost and it restores its dignity and sovereignty. I am very confident that this chamber, which laid the foundation of the lofty edifice of independence and raised its flag high, will not hesitate today to entrench the pillars of this independence, consolidate its components, and liberate the people from all forms of occupation, coercion, fear, and subservience. We look forward to a bright morrow when Lebanon is restored to its people and when the Lebanese return to their noble character. You and we are called upon today to rise to the level of thishistoric responsibility.

Your excellency the prime minister, honorable deputies, the draft agreement which is today presented to you to examine consists of a preamble, 12 articles, a security arrangements supplement, a weapons list, a military map and minutes explaining some of the vague clauses.

The agreement's preamble expresses in general the right of the states in the area to live in peace and in accordance with the UN Charter and Security Council Resolution 242 of 22 October 1967, which earned unique unanimous Arab and international approval.

The following are the principles of resolution 242:

1. Action to establish a just and durable peace in the region enabling each state in it to live in safety.

2. An end to the state of war and respect for the sovereignty, unity, and independence of every state in the region and their right to live in peace and without fear or outside threats.

3. A safeguarding of the territorial integrity of all states in the region through security arrangements, including the establishment of demilitarized zones.

These are the principles of Resolution 242.

The articles of the agreement are based to a large extent on the principles of the armistice agreement which was concluded between Lebanon and Israel on 23 March 1949, as will be shown later — this, taking into consideration the fact that the armistice was then concluded between two armies which fought each other along the Palestinian borders. This agreement, however, is concluded to guarantee the withdrawal of the Israeli army from deep inside Lebanese territory. When reviewing the articles of the agreement, it is useful to take into consideration the principles of the armistice agreement to see how these principles affect the present agreement.

The following are the principles of the armistice agreement:

— Refraining from the use of force.

— Refraining from carrying out hostile actions by the regular armed forces or by semi-regular forces.

— Acknowledging the right of both sides to live in security and freedom.

— Preventing hostile actions from the territories of any of the two sides against the other side.

— Establishing a demilitarized zone.

— Forming a joint committee to be called the Mixed Armistice Commission consisting of five members. It will include two members of each side and it will be headed by a UN representative. The meetings of the committee will be held in Lebanon and

Israel, consecutively. The committee has the right to appoint military observers from both sides to supervise the security arrangements. The Mixed Armistice Commission will supervise the interpretation of the agreement and its implementation. Members of the Mixed Armistice Commission and the military observers will have the right to move freely in the areas specified in the agreement.

— Ending the conditions threatening peace; ensuring the move from the armistice status to a better status.

These are the principles of the armistice and they are also the principles of the present draft agreement.

I will now review some of the agreement's clauses which might require an explanation, and I will comment on them as necessary.

Article 1 stipulates that the international border between Lebanon and Israel shall not be violated. This is a Lebanese condition as much as it is an Israeli condition. After all that has happened in our country and after the continuous attacks against our territory, we can say this article is basically a guarantee for Lebanon, because the biggest loser from the situation prevailing between Lebanon and Israel is Lebanon itself. If there is one state in the Arab world which needs special guarantees that its border will not be violated or its sovereignty harmed, then this state is Lebanon.

The same article also stipulates the ending of the state of war between Lebanon and Israel following the total withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces from Lebanon. When we declare the ending of the state of war, this does not mean that we are about to declare a state of peace. These are two different theories. Some Arab states have defined the difference between ending the state of war and peace as follows:

An Arab state occupied by Israel can declare the ending of the state of war with it if Israel withdraws from its territory. The state of peace is a decision which the state adopts when it is fully sovereign and independent so that the decision may express its free will and not be the subject of occupation pressures. In this agreement we exchanged Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon for our declaration that the state of war between us and it has ended. We did not declare the establishment of peace between us, and we did not declare the establishment of normal relations, because we cannot take such a step without cooperation and consultation with the Arabs concerned with the question of war and peace in this area.

After the ratification of this agreement, the Lebanese-Israeli relations will remain suspended, awaiting the just peace in the area. We are people who yearn for peace, stability, and a dignified life. We are a free, sovereign, and proud people who make the decision they want, but in the meantime we are a people who have interlinked and interwined relations with the great Arab society. We will not squander these relations or detract from them.

The principles of Article 4 are basically the principles of the armistice agreement which we reviewed before and which can be summarized as each side refraining from carrying out hostile actions against the other side. After the seventies, Lebanon — government and people — decided that their land will not be a theater or a springboard for Fedayeen action against Israel, because the Fedayeen action caused violent Israeli attacks not against the Fedayeen organizations alone but also against the Lebanese people, who have been displaced and evacuated and whose institutions, homes, and villages have been destroyed. The PLO had earlier decided that Lebanon will no longer be a theater for its military operations against Israel.

Lebanon is the only country which gave the resistance the opportunity to test the tactic of the direct war with Israel. This tactic failed and led subsequently to the failure of the resistance itself and to the devastation of Lebanon. Lebanon, which is eager to safeguard its territorial safety, is also eager to safeguard the safety of its neighbors. Therefore, we insisted that this article should include a paragraph prohibiting either side from entering the territory, skies, or territorial waters of the other side to attack a third side. Our object was to make Lebanon a territory from which Israel would be forbidden to attack Syria.

Article 5 stipulates that each side will refrain from waging propaganda campaigns against the other side. Our commitment to this article is a government commitment. Therefore, the official information media is expected not to carry out any propaganda campaigns against Israel or to instigate the people against it. However, being a democratic country where the constitution guarantees freedoms, Lebanon cannot interfere with the freedom of individuals, parties, or religions or with the freedom of speech. Therefore, this article does not jeopardize the constitutional freedoms of individuals or groups.

By accepting Article 6, Lebanon decides that it is not prepared any longer to be an arena for the conflicts and differences of others. Therefore, it willingly accepts that its land, territorial waters, or skies should not be used by any state or group which Israel might consider as hostile to it in order that Lebanon may not remain the victim of the conflict of others. However, this article does not prohibit the innocent passage of military equipment and gear.

The armistice agreement established the Mixed Armistice Commission to supervise the implementation of the agreement and its interpretation. Article 8 of the new agreement establishes a joint liaison committee to supervise its implementation. The difference between the two committees is that the third side in the armistice agreement was a representative of the United Nations whereas the third side in the new agreement is a representative of the United States. The same way that the Mixed Armistice Commission was meeting in Lebanon and Israel alternately so will the new committee meet alternately in Lebanon and Israel. The freedom of the members of the Mixed Armistice Commission was guaranteed to enable the commission to carry out its duties. This new agreement also guarantees the freedom of the members of the joint liaison committee in both countries so that they may discharge their duties.

This article stipulates that 6 months after the total withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanon, the joint liaison committee will meet and study the possibility of concluding agreements on the movement of persons and goods across the international

border between the two states.

During the negotiations, Israel insisted on including articles in the agreement specifying in detail the economic and social relations between the two countries. It also insisted that there must be normal relations, that the border should remain open the way it is now, and that each side should encourage the extensive movement of persons between them. On our part, we insisted that this agreement is basically a security arrangement and not a peace treaty regulating the normal relations between the two countries. We did so despite the continuous pressures to establish economic — if not normal, then at least seminormal — relations. We managed to attain this formula, thus postponing the question of the establishment of economic relations until a later stage in the light of the political atmosphere in the area, particularly the future atmosphere of Arab-Israeli Relations. If there is a unified Arab stand on the question of establishing relations with Israel, then Lebanon will be part of the Arab stand. It will not isolate itself from the Arab group or expose its economic conditions, because it is not prepared to open its border with Israel and consequently close its geographical, economic, and political borders with 21 Arab states.

The same way that Israel has the right to give long and thorough consideration to the adoption of sensitive and critical decisions vis-a-vis its relations with the peoples in the region, we have the right also to give thorough consideration to whatever affects our relations with the Arab world and our economy.

According to this article, the two sides pledge to annul the agreements and laws which conflict with the articles of this agreement. This is natural, because any agreement which assumes a legal status requires the introduction of amendments to previous laws and regulations which might conflict with the agreement. I will explain later that this article does not conflict with Lebanon's Arab commitments.

According to Article 10 of the agreement, the two sides agree to amend or replace this agreement when the need arises. We believe that each agreement between two states imposes restrictions on both of them. We find many restrictions in this agreement. We would have preferred it if they did not exist, but they are the price which we have been compelled to pay to liberate Lebanon. After the liberation and the restoration of our unity and credibility, we will ask the joint liaison committee to hold intensive meetings to amend or to eliminate the restrictions imposed on us by this agreement. The country will be in a state of continuous negotiations for some time in order that it may regain through wisdom and diplomacy what it lost through rashness, anarchy, and indifference.

Article 11 explains the measures which we must follow when there is a disagreement on the interpretation of the contents of the agreement. The attached explanatory minutes stipulate that the United States will promote a quick settlement of disagreements. However, the minutes also stipulate that in case of the continuation of the disagreement, then it will be referred to a third side, that is to say to the [International] Court of Justice or to any other international institutions and that the verdict of this side will be binding.

The security arrangements mentioned in the supplement are also, as you can see, a development of the armistice articles in the light of the occupation developments. The security arrangements mentioned in the supplement are based on the following:

— The security zone will extend from a line passing south of the Al-Awwali River and south of Jabal al-Baruk up to (Dayr al-'Asha'ir). You all know that Israel insisted on a security zone extending from Ad-Damur and north of Jabal al-Baruk.

The Lebanese state alone will assume the responsibility for security in the security zone without seeking the aid of the UN emergency force or the multinational force. The Lebanese Army will have two brigades in the security zone. One brigade will be deployed south of the Az-Zahrani River and the second between the Az-Zahrani and Al-Awwali Rivers. The Army can carry out military exercises with a third brigade. Thus, there will be approximately 12,000 Lebanese soldiers in the security zone. This is the strength which our Army needs to discharge its duties in the best manner in this area.

The armistice agreement permitted the presence of only 1,500 Lebanese soldiers in the security zone, which was confined to the south of Az-Zahrani. The agreement does not limit the number of the internal security, police, and auxiliary [al-ansar] forces. The main condition which the agreement imposes on the equipment of our land and naval forces is that we do not deploy sophisticated antiaircraft missiles or sophisticated radar equipment. This is a hypothetical condition as far as we are concerned, because it is not the intention to use them in the near future.

The security arrangements committee, which, like the joint liaison committee, is to include Lebanese, U.S., and Israeli representatives, will supervise the security arrangements within the joint liaison committee. The security arrangments committee will also supervise the joint verification committees which will operate on the land, in the air and at sea to ascertain the soundness of the security arrangments.

At the outset, Israel insisted on having patrols roam the local area, establish roadblocks on the international highways, search houses, interrogate people and raid suspect (?property). Thus, Israel insisted on being intensively present in that area so that everybody could see that it was still present in an effective and military manner in southern Lebanon. However, we opposed that on the grounds that the principle of patrols conflicts with Lebanese sovereignty.

No two persons can disagree that the presence of Israelis in the joint verification committees is something undesirable but a choice had to be made of either having 50,000 Israeli occupation forces present and, consequently, losing the south, or having 50 Israeli observers operate with 50 Lebanese observers under Lebanese command for a period of only 2 years. We were keen on limiting the period of the verification committees because the Israeli appearance in the security zone, though very limited, will be subject to criticism and cause problems.

We tried to delineate a security zone inside Israel in which the military forces will be limited, but Israel strongly rejected this

attempt on the grounds that it had won the war, that it is the one which lays the conditions and that it is the one which was harmed by the irregular [as heard] military action in the south. However, after a long argument, we were able to include a clause in the appendix authorizing Lebanon to send an investigatory committee to northern Israel to ascertain that there are no military concentrations or any action that threatens the safety of the Lebanese territory.

We persistently requested that the UN emergency forces remain in Lebanon but Israel rejected this on the grounds that it regards these forces as a screen behind which the Fedayeen organizations operate. However, we were able to arrive at a stipulation that ensures the presence of some UN emergency forces in the outskirts of Sidon that have the right to operate patrols in the outskirts of the Palestinian camps in Sidon and Tyre. Lebanon will request the security council to expand the task of the UN emergency force so that we will be able to benefit from them logistically in Beirut, in the north, and in Al-Biqa'.

As for the multinational force, we will seek to move them to the Lebanese international highways so that our Army may devote itself to performing purely field duties.

According to the appendix, Israel undertakes to completely withdraw from the Lebanese territory within a period ranging from 8 to 12 weeks. However, in a note it presented to the United States, Israel laid other conditions for withdrawing from Lebanon. These conditions are:

1. Complete withdrawal of the Palestinian fighters who are present in Lebanon.

2. The complete withdrawal of the Syrian Army from Lebanon;

3. The handing over of the Israeli capitves who are held by the Palestinians and the Syrians. [some commotion heard]

Therefore, this agreement will be considered ineffective, even after it is ratified, unless Syria and the PLO decide to withdraw their forces from Lebanon.

We have no doubt at all that Syria and the PLO will cooperate with Lebanon to implement the goals of the agreement. [some commotion heard] Syria declared at the Rabat summit in September 1982 and at the nonaligned summit in New Delhi that it is prepared to withdraw from Lebanon. The PLO also emphasized to us in New Delhi and afterward that it is also prepared to evacuate its forces from Lebanon. There is also Security Council Resolution 520 dated 17 September 1982 which supports Lebanon's stand on ousting all the non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon and giving the Lebanese Army alone the right to supervise security in all the Lebanese territory. However, in our relations with Syria, we will not resort to the UN resolutions but we will work and coordinate with it directly in order to emphasize to it that the agreement between Lebanon and Israel will not in any way affect Syria's security and the safety of its government.

Lebanons's objective is to establish the best, deepest, and widest relations with Syria. For this reason, the Cabinet, at its recent meeting, decided to form a high-level working team to hold intensive discussions with Syria with a view to achieving the Lebanese and Syrian national goals. We must demonstrate to Syria that the only means to restore sovereignty, as we and others know, is through the negotiations which have led to this agreement.

This agreement is complex and its implementation requires overcoming many obstacles. We too in a letter addressed to the United States have also put conditions that, if for any reason Israel does not withdraw from Lebanon, Lebanon will consider this agreement suspended or cancelled.

In this agreement, we accepted conditions which we would have preferred not to have accepted. However, in return, we have taken the territory and people of the south and, for the first time in the history of the Israeli-Arab wars, we have secured the recovery of the land without establishing peace or normal relations. [applause] All the conditions are temporary, acceptable, and reasonable compared with the dangers that existed and that would have continued to exist. Despite the fact that Lebanon, during the negotiations phase, has been an occupied, divided, and weak country, it nevertheless has a strong will, a clear vision, and a young political leadership that has, for the first time in the history of Lebanon, the consensus of all Lebanese families despite the circumstances in the areas in which they live, the occupation under which they are suffering, and the daily tragedies resulting from this occuaption.

Therefore, at a time when Lebanon, the negotiator, accepted what it regarded to be reasonable, it very proudly and willfully said no to everything that was unacceptable. Thus, as an example and not strictly speaking, we said no to holding the negotiations in the city of Jerusalem, the holy city which Lebanon believes to belong to the three religions and which Lebanon has requested be put under international supervision. We said noto political negotiations at ministerial level, no to the establishment of early warning stations, no to observation posts that ensure the continued presence of over 1,000 Israeli soldiers in southern Lebanon, no to the appointment of Israeli liaison officers in every Lebanese Army unit in the security zone and the consequent foreign military control over our young Army this entails as well as the violation of the Lebanese dignity which has refused and continues to refuse to be harmed or violated despite all the sufferings and tragedies.

We said no to giving Israel the right to approve of the Lebanese officers operating in the brigade that is present south of the Az-Zahrani River. We said no to reciprocal political recognition between the two countries, no to considering Al-Baruk as part of the security zone, despite the fact that it, like the rest of the Lebanese areas, is enjoying only Lebanese security so that it may not be said that Israel, through the verification committees, overlooks the Syrian, Turkish, Iraqi, Jordanian, and Egyptian territories from the top of Al-Baruk mountain.

We said no to Israel's imposition of a certain officer to be responsible for the southern brigade, no to Israel's demand to have the right to pursue across the Lebanese territory any group which enters Israel from Lebanon to carry out hostile actions there and then sneaks into Lebanon, because this condition would give the Israeli army the excuse to enter our territory whenever

it wished and in the numbers if deemed appropriate.

These conditions were not merely fleeting ideas put forward during the negotiations, but they were serious conditions which we discussed for months.

At the time of signing this agreement, we must speak frankly to our brothers in the Arab world and assure them that this agreement, like the armistice agreement, absolutely does not affect Lebanon's Arab relations, particularly its relations with Syria, other than to increase its strength and prosperity.

Our future role in the Arab League, in our capacity as an independent and free country, will be much stronger than our role in our capacity as a divided and occupied country. Our role as a member of the [Arab] collective defense treaty in our capacity as a sovereign, strong, and unified country will be much stronger than our role in our capacity as a country divided by the others and dependent on their will.

If Egypt, which concluded peace with Israel, has not withdrawn from the collective defense treaty, then why should anyone think that Lebanon, which has concluded an agreement mainly of a security nature, is about to withdraw from this treaty or other major Arab commitments? Lebanon is determined to discharge all its obligations within the Arab League and within the collective defense treaty. In addition, Lebanon will abide by all the ethical and patriotic charters, which are more important than any provisions.

I say to all those who expect a leading role from Lebanon, a support role during the crisis, or a creative role in the future of the Arab society: Give Lebanon an opportunity. Permit it to exist. Let it find its own way with its own mind, people, institutions, and leadership.

We said during the negotiations that we were holding discussions with Israel and the United States while watching over the interests of Syria, the Arab state which shouldered more than any other state the burdens of the military mobilization in defense of the national Arab national rights. We can say by evicting Israel from Lebanon that we are providing real security for Syria. By forbidding Israel from using Lebanese land as a passage to attack Syria, we are easing many of the risks which Syria might confront in its military equation with Israel.

Since the beginning of the negotiations, we have heard options which would spare the conclusion of a new agreement with Israel. However, it is our duty to tell you frankly from our position of responsibility that we have studied all the options and decided to continue the tripartite negotiations on the basis that they are the most effective method. I will read to you examples of what I consider some of these options:

Some proposed a recourse to the Security Council. All will testify that the Security Council cannot be effective if there is not full agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. You all know that such an agreement is impossible. It suffices in Lebanon what we have learned from the lessons of the others. We do not want to add another lesson and lose a homeland to win a case. What good is it for us to have dozens of resolutions by the Security Council and the UN General Assembly supporting our right when we are without a homeland, [word indistinct] or shelter. We are practical and we know how to treat every problem with the appropriate medicine.

It is known that the United States is the one who can best influence Israel. It is also known that the wars between the Arabs and Israel have led to nothing other than the occupation of more Arab lands. We, in Lebanon, now have a dire need to dress the wounds and unite ranks. We are also have a dire need for stability and peace to regain the homeland and resume our effective march in history.

Some proposed that we refer the Lebanese question to the Arab League or to an urgent Arab summit. I will be quick in frankly telling you that this is not an option. The previous Arab summit meetings tried to tackle the Lebanese question but they utterly failed.

I also frankly tell you that, since I assumed my responsibilities, I consulted every Arab foreign minister I met and discussed with him the possibility of resorting to an Arab summit. The response of everyone of them was negative...

[Unidentified speaker interrupts] Mr Minister, the Zionist invasion was the result of collective Arab failure. This is self-evident.

[Salim continues] Lebanon regrets that the Arab League, on which Lebanon pinned great hopes, had forgotten it and indeed often treated it as an alien member. However, despite this Arab disregard and dreadful silence, Lebanon continues to believe in the basic concepts the Arab League embodies and it looks forward to the near future when it will be able to play an appropriate role that will strengthen the league and Lebanon's role in it.

Some proposed that we work with the Soviet Union to oust Israel from Lebanon on the basis that the Soviet Union is a major power that is supporting the Arab struggle against Israel. Some of you might remember that the Lebanese Government, at the outset of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, asked the Soviet Union to intervene quickly to halt the agrgression but the Soviets replied that they could not influence Israel.

We were told that Israel will not withdraw from Lebanon because Israel is a moving camp whose aim is to annex all the Arab states adjacent to it and that the existing problem is a serious historical problem. Therefore, according to this allegation, it would not matter if we are compelled during this phase to lose areas or countries for a long time because what is importnat is that we should not lose our dignity, our will and our determination to regain our rights. What is regrettable and painful in this statement is that history is not based on right but on might; nor is it based on justice but on the peoples' skill in seizing opportunities and grabbing whatever they can in this world.

We in Lebanon are not prepared to sacrifice the south for 20 or 50 years in the hope of restoring it in the distant future to a homeland whose name, boundaries, features, and components only God knows what they will be then. Of what benefit would it be for us to gain hollow dignity and lose the south? Of what

benefit would it be for us to sacrifice the south and lose the rest of Lebanon? Of what benefit would it be for us to subject the south to Israeli domination and consequently expose the whole Lebanese society to occupation, internecine fighting, and extinction?

We were told that Israel will not withdraw from the south because, basically, it is an expansionist state. If this is the case, what do those people expect us to do? Are we to remain idle and say Israel will not withdraw because it is expansionist? Or are we to accept this situation and wait for major political developments whether at the end of this century or during the next century in the hope that the international balance of power will be upset, and, hence, states will disappear and other states will emerge and the criteria will change in the hope that we, or what is left of us, will be among the winners?

From a position of responsibility we cannot accept this political inevitability. As a logical and civilized country, we always resort to reason, politics, diplomacy, and persuasion and to some sources of power which we and our friends have to restore our rights and to ensure Lebanon's unity, its independence, and sovereignty.

We did not negotiate to regain one area of Lebanon only but to regain all Lebanon. When the whole is the target, we cannot tarry, procrastinate, or take risks. We entered these negotiations having in front of us 60 years' experience between the Zionist movement and the Palestinians and between Israel and its neighboring Arab states [sentence as heard]. We know much that is happening in lands occupied by Israel. We know much about the Israeli appetite after the occupaiton. We know what happened in the West Bank, Gaza sector, and the Golan Heights. Therefore, in view of our historic responsibility to the rising Lebanese generations, we have no right to lose the south as other Arab areas have been lost to satisfy empty slogans, hollow words, and haughty stands.

We fear lest the south may become like the [West] Bank not on the basis of what has happened in the past but on the basis of what is happening and what is being said and planned now. We began hearing a few weeks ago statements by some Israelis to the effect that the south is part of the land of Israel. We began hearing serious slogans about the south. This is not the time to discuss them because we do not want to open wounds, which we ought to dress, or open cards [as heard] which all of us hope to close forever. We have seen with our eyes airports and utilities constructed in the south. We have seen the military barracks being built as though they will be permanent. We have read about the national guard and the logistics bases. We began to read, think, and see, and we were disturbed.

The Israeli occupation of the south is not, as some believe, a process of repentance ['amaliyyat 'add asabi'] as far as we are concerned because Israel reaps enormous economic profits from the occupation. If Israel manages to control the south as it controlled Sinai in the past and as it is controlling the West Bank, then the gains which it will reap from the occupation of our land will be no less than $2 billion annually. Let nobody forget that Israel needs the Al-Litani River which could secure for it 50 percent of the waters it will need in the near future.

In line with its political ideology, Israel wants land, agriculture, and water. The Lebanese south, which is the most fertile land in Lebanon, can be lost and become a part of Israel overnight if we do not resort to wisdom and courage at the appropriate time.

The West Bank has become an area for exporting workers to Israel. The south could become the same. The West Bank is now fully dependent on Israel's exports and the south could become the same. The plans and studies to divert the Al-Litani waters through canals and tunnels passing near Marj 'Uyun and then to Bet Neqofa village in Northern Israel, where they will be connected with the existing Israeli irrigation system, are now complete. What remains is an order for implementation. Israel cannot fully exploit the Al-Litani waters if it does not keep the area it is occupying now in order to defend the course of this river and obtain the waters from the area nearest to the sea. It is impossible to effectively benefit from the Al-Litani's present course which is 2-km from the Israeli border.

Rumors spread, in the course of the Israeli occupation, about the establishment of secterian statelets on the body of the one Lebanese family. We have read in the papers and in the memoranda about the benefits of dividing the Lebanese homeland into homelands including a Druze homeland, a Shi'ite homeland, and a Christian homeland. These rumors went beyond Lebanon to speak about the establiishment of an 'Alawite homeland. Others might consider these rumors with indifference and pay no attention to them. However, we, who witnessed the tragedies of division and what others can do among the members of the Lebanese family, cannot disregard these rumors. We have felt some of its reality and we have been burned by some of its fire.

I want to tell you now my opinion which frankly might displease some of those who have firm stands on Lebanon. I do not believe in the inevitability of the annexation of the south to Israel. It is true that at the peace conference in Paris, the Zionist movement presented several maps of the future Israel which take Israel's northern border to the Al-Litani River and even to the Al-Awwali River.

Some of you remember the correspondence exchanged among the senior Israeli politicians and the arguments at the Knesset which every now and then were about Lebanon. In 1967, Israel did not try to occupy the south although it could find suitable excuses to do so. Israel did not try to occupy the south in 1973, although it could find strategic reasons for this. However, it invaded the south in 1972 and later occupied it in June 1982. If we do not resort to rationality now and sign this agreement, before Israel changes its mind, and oust the Israeli army from Lebanon, Israel will find its presence in Lebanon profitable and it will take Lebanon's obstinacy as an excuse for remaining in Lebanon permanently.

The negotiations process during the past 6 months was extremely difficult because Israel used to present to us the conditions of the victor over the vanquished while the U.S. negotiator used to try to bring the viewpoints together and to convince both sides to make concessions. Were it not for the U.S. intervention, we would not have been able to reach an agreement that will lead to a complete Israeli withdrawal without the conclusion of a peace treaty, without the establishment of normal economic relations,

and without an intensive Israeli military presence remaining in the south. We often found ourselves between two [word indistinct]. But we held fast to our redlines although we only had the power of what is right, the power of [word indistinct] and the power of rejection. We should not forget that the negotiations were held under occupation and while incidents, internecine fighting, and massacres were taking place on the ground. The Lebanese negotiator had one eye on the situation and the other eye on a people engaged in infighting and on a country that is breaking up and a homeland that is at the brink of the abyss.

Gentlemen, from the beginning of the negotiations we were eager to acquaint you and the Arab countries concerned with the developments on the negotiations. As you know, periodic meetings were held with the Arab ambassadors. We acquainted them with everything we were doing. We also discussed alternatives with them. We must declare before the Lebanese and all the Arab people that, after the detailed presentation and a study of the alternatives, we used to hear [from the ambassadors] only complete support for the Lebanese negotiating stand. We must remind the Arab world today that all the parliamentary delegations, which visited the Arab kings and presidents and explained our stand to them, returned with their complete and unconditional support for the line which Lebanon was pursuing to achieve the withdrawal of the Israeli army from its territory, especially because we respected the basic principles on the basis of which we negotiated with Israel, which were: national consensus, complete withdrawal, Lebanese sovereignty, and Lebanon's Arab relations. Now that we have reaped the fruits of our intensive efforts and obtained the best we could, we expect unanimous Arab support because we are in the process of liberating our territory from occupation, ridding our country of the dangers of annexation and fragmentation, and sparing our people from emigration and evacuation. Ours is not the first state in the Arab world that sought the assistance of the United States to secure the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from its territory. Since the early seventies, every Arab state, which fought Israel, has been compelled to cooperate with the Americans to achieve a disengagment of armies or to ensure certain withdrawals or complete withdrawal. We are not the first to ask the United States to have a certain presence on our territory — through the security arrangements committee — to ensure the complete implementation of the security arrangements concluded between Israel and us.

All the Arab states which Israel fought have accepted security arrangements on their territory with the following characteristics:

1. Zones with limited weapons;

2. Buffer zones;

3. International or American observers, or both, and usually an insistence on both;

4. Bilateral security agreements;

5. An exchange of letters with the Americans regarding certain details pertaining to the security arrangements.

6. A public or implicit pledge to keep the Palestinian military organizations at certain distances from the Israeli border.

We realize that this agreement does not mean the end of Lebanon's tragedies. It is however, undoubtedly, the start of Lebanon's restoration of its sovereignty and unity. When Lebanon is fully liberated from all the non-Lebanese armies and forces on its land, the march will then begin to liberate the Lebanese citizen from the vestiges of the war and to rebuild the one and unified Lebanese homeland which is invulnerable to new setbacks despite the political storms blowing in its face from here and there.

We look forward to a day soon when we will know our borders and our villages spread on these borders from An-Naqurah to Yarun, 'Aytarun, Dayr Mimas, Shab'a, Dayr al-'Asha'ir, 'Anjar, Brital, Nahlah, Al-Qa', Wadi Khalid, Al-'Aridah and up to the coastal cities which are rich in their history and civilization.

Honorable deputies, we come to your chamber with our heads raised because our faith is strong and our conviction is firm that by this agreement we are placing Lebanon on the right path to liberate all its territory. We are fully confident that you will bless our steps, support our achievements, and strngthen our determination to continue our work for Lebanon's victory, its presitge and dignity. [applause]

Sa'ib Salam Calls for Negotiations With Syria

NC162052 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1802 GMT 16 May 83

[Statement by former Lebanese Prime Minister Sa'ib Salam at 16 May Chamber of Deputies' session convened to review Lebanese-Israeli agreement — recorded]

Text] Mr Speaker, distinguished colleagues. I wish to say a few calm words following this comprehensive review by his excellency the foreign minister. In my opinion, he did not tell us anything new except that he insisted on facts. This insistence was appropriate and timely.

We are at present facing grave dangers on all levels, represented by occupation, the presence of gunmen in Lebanon, internal division, the high cost of living, and complaints against the government. All these things have accumulated, rendering the Lebanese citizen more inclined to reject then to accept.

Let me be frank. Because of the historic situation we are facing, this distinguished chamber has been accustomed to adopting historic stands. The first sign of its historic stand today is the overwhelming attendance by the distinguished deputies.

We cannot but appreciate the government for the hard work it has done over the past months. We cannot but view in the light of this what the government will do in the months ahead. What the government has done in the past and what it will do in the future are based on two points: The first point is our cohesive domestic front which was unanimously expressed by this chamber at its last session [applause]. The second thing is the limits which we have set from the beginning and which we do not allow

ourselves to exceed. They are domestic limits on which there is no need to elaborate today — preserving dignity, preserving sovereignty, preserving the land — and foreign limits connected with our Arab brothers, especially our closest sister Syria. The proof is that the special clause which was mentioned in this statement stipulates that the two parties will not implement this draft agreement unless Syria agrees to withdraw its army from Lebanon.

Therefore, through this distinguished chamber, we must stick with the first point by repeating the unanimous Lebanese support for the government today, despite the complaints you, or some of you, and I, personally more than anyone of you, have about the behavior of the government, about those who are behind the government and those who are with the government. However, this is not the time to settle accounts at this chamber. We must stand together and be united as Lebanese in the face of all the dangers confronting us. The domestic front is our strongest weapon. We do not have aircraft, guns and tanks with which to fight. We resort to diplomatic methods and to the strength of the Lebanese people's solidarity. This strength is our only weapon against the grave events we are facing.

The second point is related to our Arab brothers. I don't believe that the government has been slack. On the contrary, it has diligently and constantly sought to contact every Arab brother, far and near, to explain Lebanon's stand and position, as was accurately and carefully explained now by the foreign minister. The government has sought to win support for Lebanon's stand at this historic juncture.

There is sister Syria, which has adopted a stand, as you heard, and as was published and broadcast. However, I have information affirming to me that the door is open for negotiation. Therefore, we must pursue the course of negotiation. As I have said, in the face of the enemy, we have had no weapon except our solidarity and the persuasive diplomatic method. With our brothers in Syria, this must be stronger than it was with the enemy. In addition to this, there is the element of love with which we must negotiate with Syria. We cannot sleep on hostility or hatred and still hope that our negotiations with sister Syria may bear fruit. I hope this is clear. I urge that our stand be steadfast behind the government, that it be unanimous and strong, representing the Lebanese public opinion. I urge that a special recommendation be adopted — it is not necessary that it be made public — that the negotiations with Syria be held in a spirit of love — brotherly love — regardless of the rejection or [words indistinct] we will meet.

In my opinion, Lebanon was founded on certain tenets. Lebanon was founded on love. Were it not for love which offsets some bad deeds emanating from this or that party, we would be in a worse situation as Lebanese, especially at present. Let me be frank. I say that the Muslims are bearing what the mountains can't bear for the sake of saving their country. Let my brothers hear me with love, and clearly, and let them realize this. We are not trying to be boastful. This is our duty. This is our homeland. This is what duty prompts us to do. However, I am drawing attention to things which are subjecting the domestic front to fragmentation, God forbid. We must be concerned about this, and this concern must be shown by everybody.

The Muslims were the makers of this country. I wish to refer to those who mention that Lebanon is 6,000 or 7,000 years old. Our brothers the Maronites were not here 6,000 years ago. They were here only over 1,000 years ago. [some heckling heard] Our brothers the Maronites were not here 6,000 years ago. [more heckling heard] Lebanon — its trees, birds and rivers — is a gift from God to us. However, Lebanon — the country, the independent and free state — is the Lebanon for all of us. It is our Lebanon. We must say that the Muslims are a founding element. This was the case in 1943 and this should be the case today. [applause]

Therefore, I affirm that despite all the anguish we feel, we will not neglect our duty. We must strengthen independent Lebanon, which began 40 years ago, with a more determined stand than the stand which was adopted in 1943.

As I understand it, during this meeting the government wanted to fully explain its stand and the conditions of the agreement after quarters abroad interpreted the agreement according to their whims. I do not believe that the government wants today any voting on the agreement. This is because voting on the agreement will take place after it is officially concluded. The agreement has not been officially concluded, but I do not give lessons on the constitution. The negotiator negotiates and the negotiator signs. Moreover, there are the constitutional measures. This requires signing by the president of the republic, approval by the Cabinet, sending it to this chamber and its ratification by this chamber. Without this, it will not be an agreement. Therefore, we are not [words indsitinct]. All I call for is that this chamber today issue a unanimous resolution. I propose that we do not open the door of discussion for long. I hope I will be understood by all. [some heckling heard] I hope that my proposal will be accepted, namely that we let the speaker say taht the chamber has taken notice and has heard the explanations made by the foreign minister and that the chamber is unanimously determined to preserve Lebanese domestic unity, which is the basis of every Lebanese action. [applause]

Speaker al-As'ad Comments on Chamber Session

NC161556 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1515 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] The Chamber of Deputies' session ended at 1315 today. At 1415, the Chamber of Deputies Speaker Kamil al-As'ad held a press conference during which he read the text of the Chamber of Deputies' recommendation [tawsiyah]. He pointed out that the minutes of the session will be publicized and called on the journalists to only consider the official minutes of the session.

Speaker al-As'ad said: The agreement was not discussed during the Chamber of Deputies session with a view toward adopting a stand, because this contravenes Article 52 of the constitution, which provides that a draft agreement must be signed and then referred to the Chamber of Deputies in accordance with a decree before it is submitted for debate at the Chamber of Deputies. This did not take place today.

Al-As'ad stressed that the results that the Lebanese side has achieved with respect to the agreement did not cross the redlines

[khutut humr]. These results are within these limits and it is on this basis that the Chamber of Deputies supports the government.

Replying to a question regarding objections to the agreement, Al-As'ad said that Lebanon has reached [the goal] of ending the Israeli occupation while maintaining its sovereignty and independence. This is not only a Lebanese gain but also an Arab gain, because the plot being engineered through Lebanon is aimed against all the Arab countries, particularly Syria. We believe that the liberation of Lebanon is a pan-Arab interest and primarily a Syrian-Lebanese interest.

Deputies Say Chamber Recommendation Not Unanimous
NC170659 (Clandestine) Voice of Arab Lebanon in Arabic 0530 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] To clarify what went on in yesterday's Chamber of Deputies' session, Deputies Nazim al-Qadiri, Salah al-Khayr, Najah Wakim, Zahir al-Khatib, and Zaki Mazbudi have issued a joint statement which says that the agreement and the statement of the foreign minister were not the subject of discussion or deliberation, that no recommendation was taken unanimously, and that no vote was taken on it according to the rules, but through applause.

Qulaylat Meets With USSR Envoy Soldatov
NC141508 (Clandestine) Voice of Arab Lebanon in Arabic 1340 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Brother Ibrahim Qulaylat [leader of the Independent Nasirite Movement, al-Murabitun] and members of the movement's leadership Ahmad Zaydan, Dr Hashim Ayyubi and Lawyer Walid at-Turk, met for well over 2 hours with Soviet Ambassador Aleksandr Soldatov and some of the Soviet Embassy's senior staff members. During the meeting, they made a comprehensive assessment of the current stage of the national Lebanese, Arab, and international levels.

Following the meeting, Brother Qulaylat made the following statement:

. .ne Independent Nasirite Movement, al-Murabitun, emphasizes its continued appreciation of the firm and strategic Soviet stand on the side of Arab rights and legitimate issues, foremost of which is the Palestinian people's cause. This strategic Soviet stand is demonstrated under these fateful circumstances by its support for Syria and the Palestinian revolution, particularly since we are living in a most serious stage in the confrontation with the Zionist enemy and the hostile forces in the area. Qulaylat added, it is clear that the Soviet stand supports the unity of the Lebanese territory and people and the restoration off the national characteristics, sovereignty, and democratic freedoms for all citizens throughout Lebanon. He said that the Soviet stand is indisputable regarding the overall and unconditional withdrawal of the Zionist enemy.

Qulaylat reaffirmed the Al-Murabitun movement's declared and specific stand and its views and assessment that any meetings, agreements, or negotiations between the authority and the Zionist enemy must take place only within the framework of a program with Lebanese conditions for the withdrawal of the Zionist enemy from all Lebanese territory, beginning with the south. This must be a principled provision that does not contravene with the priority of the withdrawal [sentence as heard]. We agree with all the effective national and Islamic forces on this stand.

Qulaylat said, with respect to the available articles of the agreement, that the Nasirite movement affirms that the agreement must only consider the military aspect of withdrawal without any political implications for the present or the future. He said: As the articles of the agreement become known, we are worried that the big detention camp in Answar was not discussed during the talks as a basic and principled Lebanese condition. In the Ansar camp the faithful, struggling, and patriot vanguard of our Lebanese and Palestinian people are suffering from all forms of oppression and repression.

Nationalist Groups Reject Israeli Agreement
JN142016 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1815 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Zgharta —An expanded meeting was held at noon today at the residence of former Lebanese President Sulayman Franjiyah attended by: Rashid Karami, former Lebanese prime minister; Comrade 'Asim Qansuh, secretary of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party organization in Lebanon; Walid Junblatt, leader of the Progressive Socialist Party; George Hawi, secretary of the Central Committee of the Lebanese Communist Party; Mahmud 'Abd al-Khaliq, deputy leader of the Syrian Social Nationalist Party in Lebanon; and Marwan Hamadah, a former Lebanese minister.

The discussion during this meeting dealt with the latest developments in Lebanon in light of the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement and the negative effects which this agreement might have on the Lebanese people and the Arabs in general. This meeting is considered an initial attempt by Lebanese nationalist [wataniyah] organizations and figures to persuade the Lebanese officials not to get involved in signing an agreement with Israel. The meeting resulted in the preparation of a memo in this respect which will be given to a personal representative of Lebanese President Amin al-Jumayyil who will come to Zgharta on Monday. Copies of the memo shall also be sent to the heads of all Arab and foreign diplomatic missions in Lebanon.

The SANA correspondent has learned that the heads of nationalist progressive parties and Lebanese personages who are opposed to the draft agreement will meet at a later date, after President al-Jumayyil has been acquainted with the purport of their memo, to organize the line of opposition to the draft agreement, to coordinate stands and to consider the means they deem essential to prevent its ratification.

After the meeting, Karami held a press conference which was attended by the correspondents of Arab and foreign news agencies and newspapers.

Karami said: [Begin recording] We convened this meeting today

out of our awareness of our historical responsibility to face the dimensions and implications of the draft agreement which has been published and is now clear to everyone. It is obvious that the agreement entails political, security, economic and crucial dangers. We have read the draft agreement and discussed it. We are expressing the feelings of the majority of the Lebanese. We wished other brothers had attended this meeting. However, this does not prevent me from affirming that many forces and organizations support our stand and line as stated in the memo, which we will communicate to his excellency the president and everyone concerned at home and on the arab and international levels.

If ratified, this draft agreement will lead to a separate peace treaty with the enemy under a different garb. Consequently, it will lead to an end of the state of war. This will cause Lebanon to depart from the Arab fold. It will also undermine Lebanese relations, both locally between Lebanese and with the Arabs.

The draft agreement does not preserve Lebanese sovereignty, because the measures and arrangements therein give the enemy many privileges as well as a free hand in Lebanese territory, airspace and territorial waters. Furthermore, the draft agreement emphasizes that Lebanon shall not allow any quarter whatsoever to use Lebanese territory as a base for aggression on Israel. The draft also does not permit any quarter, even in Lebanon, to attack or criticize Israel.

We wonder: What is the use of this agreement when it stipulates that Israel will only pull out in a synchronous withdrawal or after the withdrawal of the Syrians and Palestinians? Syria has frankly announced its position, saying that the agreement violates Lebanon's sovereignty and security as well as Syrian security. Therefore, we must announce our Lebanese national [watani] position, because we believe that it is the duty of all honest men to struggle to foil all these harmful results which place Lebanon under the hegemony of Zionism and Imperialism.

We also would like to draw attention to all the evil and harm which everyone has begun to see, especially on the economic level. What Israel has not been able to gain hitherto will be negotiated 6 months after the signing of the agreement. Thus the plot against Lebanon will be complete. Thus, Israel will be able to undermine Lebanon's role and mission and deprive it of all its interests and gains.

Here we would like to draw the attention of the officials to the consequences and implications of the signing of this agreement. We will make contacts with all sides and the citizens in order to explain our opinions and fears and to determine our steps. Therefore, we will, in the course of our action, make all the arrangements to strengthen Lebanon's position and gain the support of fraternal Arab states for our struggle as well as the support of the friendly states and international circles. In fact, we consider Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509 as means for liberating and saving Lebanon without any restrictions or conditions. We also consider unity of Lebanon as the strongest weapon for confronting the occupier and evicting it from our land, stressing the president's statement that he will not sign an agreement which violates Lebanon's sovereignty, until Lebanon can evacuate the enemy from its territory.

We would like to recall the Arab position against Egypt when it signed agreements with the Israeli enemy unilaterally. Therefore, we stress the government's statements on Lebanon's relations and its Arab role. In fact, we cannot bear the reactions to this agreement, which is against our interest, fate, and sovereignty. After we have assessed our Lebanese national position, we find that Syria's position is in harmony with our principles. We reject and stress the need for drawing the attention of the officials to these repercussions because Lebanon's interest lies in acting with its fraternal Arabs and not with Israel. We also recall our foreign minister's statement that Lebanon cannot open one door to the enemy to close 22 doors to the Arab states. [end recording]

Al-Murabitun Issues Statement On Draft Agreement

NC161648 (Clandestine) Voice of Arab Lebanon in Arabic 1345 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] The higher central political committee of the Independent Nasirite Movement — Al-Murabitun — has issued the following statement:

In view of the agreements currently being made in the Lebanese arena, affecting the Lebanese issue and the Arab cause in general, the movement wishes to explain its stand toward these plans on all levels:

1. On the level of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement: While living through a fateful stage these days — the basic dimensions of which represent the labor pains in the birth of a plan for a separate peace or for a political term which has become known in the Middle East as the Camp David agreements — we must say that this draft agreement is a new agreement that can be coined as Camp David agreement no. 2.

Here we must recall our movement's stand since the beginning of the tripartite negotiations, a stand which has served to guide and warn on the Lebanese and Arab levels against entering the mazes of a new tent of a new Camp David similar to the Egyptian tent 101. The negotiations in occupied Khaldah or in occupied Al-Kahlisah [Qiryat Shemona] have led to this result. This result is not in the interest of national sovereignty, the unity of the land, or the citizen, because the Israeli withdrawal conditions reflect political, economic, and security privileges to the enemy.

Our movement adopted this declared stand several months ago for the following reasons:

A. The nature of the weak and disintegrated Arab situation which was completely exposed by the 4 June war.

B. The continuation of the state of division and of the internal fighting in the Lebanese arena.

C. The Israeli occupation and the Zionist-U.S. military superiority in addition to the unilateral U.S. handling of the negotiations.

D. The nonexistence of a general national Lebanese agreement prior pursuit of any negotiations or agreements, particularly following what befell a Lebanese national and Islamic party

through Israel's fascist 4 June war whose effects in terms of destruction, oppression, and injustice still exist.

Now, after the content of the agreement has become known, we again ask the officials concerned not to rush into signing this agreement. This is because in view of the crucial nature of an agreement on such a level with the historic enemy, the agreement should be preceded by a formula based on a comprehensively unified Lebanese stand that would correct all the effects of Israel's war, plan, and occupation, after what befell a Lebanese party as a result of the Zionist 4 June war and its effects. This dimension, which has always been a necessity, is now supposed to be the only national principle which must be achieved. In the event this principle is not achieved, there is the danger that internal Lebanese division and fighting will deepen and that the contradiction in our internal, Arab, and Palestinian relations will also deepen.

Finally the movement, with a complete sense of national responsibility, asks the officials concerned to realize objectively, with national responsibility, to thoroughly assess the truth of the crucial options which we might reach — options which would perhaps be the last for our citizens who have been experiencing the sequence of the plot for several years.

2. On the Palestinian level and on the level of the recent information campaign unleashed at this crucial time against the Palestinian revolution forces: The movement assesses this campaign as an important hostile link which must be confronted and dealt with. From our position, from our firm national stands, and from our constant and crucial alliance with the causes of the Palestinian people, we have the right to ask the revolution forces and our Palestinian people to settle this situation internally on the following bases:

A. Developing and enhancing the principle, purity, and revolutionism of the unified political program of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO.

B. Developing and enhancing the struggle course; namely, armed struggle, and learning a lesson from the negative effect of the decision to leave Beirut.

C. Protecting Palestinian national unity and strengthening the formulas that will prevent the use of the recognition card.

3. On the internal level: The movement is closely following the recent developments in the mountain war and the extension of the war to the Al-Iqlim area. This has given rise to real fears about the future of this Islamic and national area on the geographic and demographic levels. This makes it imperative that all the Islamic and national forces be vigilant against a set of dangers which, in our view, represent the outcome of a plan whose objectives have become known. If we do not stop this plan as of now, it will effectively achieve two objectives. The first objective is to forcibly evacuate our kinfolk in the Al-Iqlim area in the course of suspect plans to fragment the ties of the national structure and to set up sectarian entities on its ruins. The second objective is to impose the political domination and hegemony of a certain party by the occupying power with the aim of achieving the occupying power's plans and objectives.

VOL Reports Call up of Syrian Reservists

NC161742 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1723 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] The Voice of Lebanon has learned that Syrian Army reservists have been alerted and that reservists between the ages of 18 to 55 have been called up. Thousands of Soviet soldiers can be seen in Syria at a time when talk is rife there about a war which people say may take place shortly. Our correspondent has also learned that a military order has been issued to Syrian check points in Lebanon to prevent any Syrian citizen from crossing the borders toward Beirut.

Syrians Cut All Roads Linking Beirut, Damascus

NC171202 Paris AFP in English 1156 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] Beirut, May 17 (AFP) — Syrian troops stationed in Lebanon today closed off all roads linking Beirut to Damascus, shortly before Israel and Lebanon signed their U.S.-mediated troop withdrawal accord.

Taxi drivers who travel daily from here to Damascus said Syrian troops had shut down (?the Beirut-Damascus Highway) near Sawfar, a town southeast of here, as well as two other roads further north.

A coastal highway to Damascus through northern Lebanon was also cut off near the Madfun Bridge, 40 km (25 miles) north of Beirut.

The taxi drivers said they found the roads shut in both directions.

Earlier today a spokesman for the Lebanese Christian militia said Syrians had closed off two roads linking Beirut to the Al-Biqa' [words indistinct] Lebanon where the bulk of Syrian occupying troops are deployed.

Lebanese police confirmed the closure of one road northeast of Beirut.

There was no immediate explanation for the move, but (?there is speculation) here that the Syrians might be attempting to impose a blockade against Beirut, which receives its fuel supplies from the northern Lebanese port of Tripoli.

Last night, motorists here were lining up to buy gas for fear of shortages today.

Lebanese Forces Score Syrian Rejection of Pact

NC161911 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1742 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] The Lebanese Forces Command Council has held its weekly meeting under Fadi Afram and in the presence of its members. The conferees reviewed the latest developments in the Lebanese and regional arenas. Following the meeting, the official spokesman for the Lebanese forces Command made the following statement:

1. In the past few days Lebanon has proven the cohesiveness of

its structure, as shown for the first time in several years by the adoption of a national decision independent of all foreign influences. The unanimous approval of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement at the Cabinet meeting and at the Chamber of Deputies session demonstrates the proficiency of the government and shows world public opinion that the people are united in fateful situations.

2. The Lebanese Forces condemn and strongly reject the Syrian interference in Lebanese affairs and call on the Lebanese people with all their factions to stand united in confronting the Syrians' desperate attempts. Out of their faith in the homeland's supreme interests, the Lebanese forces address an urgent and sincere appeal to the Lebanese personalities whom the Syrian regime is trying to drag into positions that run counter to Lebanon's interests. The Lebanese forces appeal to these personalities to return to their Lebanese identity before the people abandon them once and for all, because under such conditions, the people will show no mercy.

3. Regarding the threats Damascus is making agaisnt the state, leadership, institutions, and people, the Lebanese Forces Command Council is obliged to remind the Syrian rulers that the Lebanese forces will not stand with their hands folded when confronted with any aggression and that no one is far from the arm of resistance.

Strikes To Be Staged To Protest Accord Signing

NC170704 (Clandestine) Voice of Arab Lebanon in Arabic 0530 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] At its meeting yesterday the northern coordination committee announced its rejection of the agreement and declared its full support for the Zgharta meeting.

Today, Al-Biqa' will witness a general strike called by the national forces to protest and denounce the agreement.

The Muslim Ulema Grouping in Lebanon has also called for a sit-in strike at the Imam ar-Rida Mosque in Bi'r al-'Abd from 1100 today in protest against the signing of the agreement between Lebanon and Israel.

Khaddam Comments on Agreement, Other Issues

AL-KHALIJ Interview

GF151456 Ash-Shariqah AL-KHALIJ in Arabic 15 May 83 pp 1, 14

[Article by AL-KHALIJ correspondent in Damascus Jum'ah al-Lami]

[Text] Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam has said that Syria is facing U.S. strategy in Lebanon not only Israeli strategy. He asserted: "We in Syria do not succumb to threats or blackmail. We are an independent country and we shall resist. We will defend our principles and interests with all our power."

In statements to AL-KHALIJ, Khaddam said that Syria will exercise its legitimate right of self-defense, and a Zionist aggression against the Syrian forces in Lebanon will not be a happy picnic for the Israeli forces.

The Syrian minister said that the Soviet Union has fulfilled its commitments to Syria and that "we are assured of Soviet assistance." Khaddam said that contacts have been held between Syria and Jordan. He noted: some issues have been discussed with King Husayn and we are waiting to hear Amman's views on these issues.

He said that Syria views the Palestinian question as its pivotal cause and therefore, there are no differences with the PLO, although there are some problems with some [PLO] leaders.

Asked about the U.S. defense secretary's warning to Syria and the Syrian response to it, Khaddam said: the Zionist invasion of Lebanon was the result of a U.S.-Israeli agreement reached following the visit of former U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig to the region and his advancing the theory of a strategic agreement. He made arrangements for the invasion to end the existence of Lebanon as an independent and sovereign state and tie it to Israel. When the next stage was implemented, imposing negotiations in the name of the PLO between Jordan and Israel, the United States would complete the chains of the Camp David policy and impose its hegemony on the region. Israel would not have been able to invade Lebanon and occupy an Arab capital without U.S. approval. Therefore, in Lebanon, we are not facing Israel alone. We are also facing a U.S. strategy that conflicts with our national aims and aspirations and conflicts with the interests of the Arab nation and with the interests of Syria.

As for what is said and published by U.S. officials, this concerns them alone. The United States must realize that it is not alone in the world and that it is not in a position to make decisions and then give orders to the peoples of the world to implement these decisions. We are an independent and sovereign country and do not submit to threats or blackmail. We shall resist and we will defend our principles and interests with all our power. The Americans are aware that such methods are futile. Peoples determine their national identity by their struggle and not through the hegemony which the United States is trying to impose on the Arabs.

Answering a question on the interpretation of the U.S. threat, and how it may be construed as a green light to Israel to attack the Arab forces in Al-Biqa', and consequently, to drag Syria into war, Khaddam said: Whether the U.S. statements are a green, yellow, or red light, when we are attacked we shall resist aggression with all our strength and we shall exercise our legitimate right of self-defense. Both Israel and the United States are aware that an aggression against our forces in Lebanon will not be a happy picnic for the Israeli forces. There will be great losses for the two sides. There is no doubt that our potential as a people struggling to liberate our land in the face of aggression is greater than the potential of the Israeli enemy. If aggression should take place the war will not be limited, and of course, neither the Israelis nor ourselves will be able to limit operations. Operations will develop into all out operations. Israel knows this, and the United States knows it. Both of them know the possible consequences.

Khaddam added: Regardless of the balance of forces between us and the Israeli enemy, a tip in the balance of forces will never make us cede one inch of Arab land or one grain of the rights of our nation in Lebanon, Palestine, Syria, or anywhere else.

AL-KHALIJ: Is this Syrian determination a warning to Israel and the United States not to become embroiled in a war whose results are not known?

Khaddam: We have warned them in the past, in an official statement. The United States is not alone in the world. We also are not alone. No physical power, however great, can undermine our determination and will. The current beleagueringis not directed against Syria alone, but is also directed against the entire Arab nation. This is because the U.S.-Israeli strategic alliance seeks to humiliate our nation and subjugate it to the interests of certain world imperialist parties and Zionism.

AL-KHALIJ: Is this Syrian stand due only to the Syrian people's strength or is it also due to Arab support and the supportive international stand, particularly the Soviet stand?

Khaddam: Our confidence, above all, stems from our confidence in the Syrian people and their potential and in our Armed Forces and their preparedness. Our confidence also stems from our pan-Arab affiliation. Fate has placed us in an advanced position in the current historic conflict between Zionism and the Arab nation. I also want to say that Soviet support and assistance to us play a great role in our steadfastness and determination. The Israeli arsenal is full of weapons given by the United States. Therefore, in such a situation we must look for friends and strengthen our relations with them. The Soviet Union is foremost among these friends who stand by us and support us.

AL-KHALIJ: do you have assurances that the Soviet Union will not leave Syria alone?

Khaddam: Some Western circles are trying to cast doubts on the Soviet Union's support for and assistance to us. These Western circles are saying to us: "You are weak and there is no one with you. You have no choice other than to capitulate." We have the Soviet Union, a friendly and loyal country that has fulfilled its

commitments. It is fulfilling these commitments seriously. We are confident of Soviet support and sure of the Soviet stand.

AL-KHALIJ: With regard to your relations with Jordan, we have information that there has been an exchange of letters between you and the Jordanian foreign minister. What do you expect from Jordan in light of the Israeli-U.S. threat to Syria?

Khaddam: I want to emphasize that Syria will stand by Jordan if fraternal Jordan is attacked by Israel. We will carry out all our pan-Arab commitments toward Jordan. This is because any threat to any part of the Arab homeland, including Jordan, is a threat to us. However, there is a situation we donot want to exist in our relations with Jordan. This is due to two things: First, there are some members of the Muslim Brotherhood gang who have made Jordan and some Arab countries their base, and from there, launched acts of sabotage against Syria. The second factor is the Jordanian position on the Arab-Israeli conflict and our view of this conflict. During the visits of the seven-member Arab committee I met twice with King Husayn. We discussed relations between the two countries and the possibility of returning them to their normal state. Some issues were discussed and we are still waiting for an answer from Amman.

AL-KHALIJ: Can we know some of these issues?

Khaddam: I prefer not to discuss with the media now what we expect from Amman with regard to the issues which I discussed with King Husayn.

AL-KHALIJ: What about Palestinian-Syrian relations? Have the political matters that have been agreed upon been implemented? Frankly, will you allow the [Palestinian] fighters to enter Syria? Have the Pakestinian weapons been released?

Khaddam: There is no problem between Syria and the PLO. You know that since its inception, the PLO was embraced by Syria. Historically, it was Syria that has made itself a base for the pan-Arab struggle against Israel. This is because Syria views the Palestinian question as its major cause. There is no problem with the PLO, but there are problems with some PLO leaders on some issues. Then the [PNC] held its latest session in Algiers and adopted resolutions that we believe are to a great extent compatible with our policy. We saw that the ground exists for eliminating these problems. Hence, President Hafiz al-Asad received brother Yasir 'Arafat and other PLO Executive Committee members. As for the other issues that are connected with security, these are discussed by representatives of the PLO and the competent authorities in Syria.

AL-KHALIJ: And relations with Fatah?

Khaddam: Relations with Fatah are good. There are no problems now. Syria is theirs. The internal affairs of every organization concern that organization and we do not interfere in them. On our part the relations are correct. The only thing we ask of some Palestinian leaders is to adhere to the resolutions of the PNC and the Arab summit and to what Palestinian institutions say and decide.

AL-KHALIJ: What about President Al-Asad's recent visit to Saudi Arabia and his talks there? Will Saudi Arabia intervene militarily on Syria's side if Syria is attacked by Israel?

Khaddam: Saudi Arabia stands by Syria and supports it fully. If we should be the victim of Zionist aggression and ask for military support from our Saudi brothers they will not hesitate in helping Syria militarily. In this regard we have the experience of 1973.

At the end of the meeting held by the AL-KHALIJ correspondent in Khaddam's office in Damascus, the Syrian foreign minister expressed pessimism on the possibility of reviving the eastern front. He said that the situation has become very complex as a result of the continuation of the Iraq-Iran war. He said that 2 days after the outbreak of the war Syria embarked on an Arab action to bring about a just solution to the war. However, he said, "the Syrian endeavors completely failed."

Damascus Reports AS-SAFIR Interview

JN161632 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1515 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] In Beirut, the Lebanese newspaper AS-SAFIR today published an interview with 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, on the Lebanese-Israeli agreement and the grave dangers resulting from it.

In the interview, Khaddam said that the Lebanese Government surprised Syria by the contents of the agreement it intends to sign with Israel because the information it provided Syria on the negotiations is in complete contrast with the results. Khaddam said that Syria had recognized the establishment of an independent Lebanese state in 1943 on the basis of commitments by the Lebanese leaders that Lebanon would not be used as a base for imperialism or a base from which fraternal Arab states are colonized. He said that the agreement with Israel will undermine the foundations upon which Lebanon was built and therefore its relations with Syria.

Khaddam refuted the articles of the agreement, particularly those that infringe on Lebanese sovereignty, independence, and national unity, as well as those constituting a source of threat to Syria's security. He said: We entered [Lebanon] in 1976 to avert a situation of victor and vanquished and to avert the establishment of repression. In no way can we accept a continuation of the deteriorating situation. We will not allow the implementation of a scheme aimed against the nationalists and Muslims in Lebanon, through which hundreds of thousands of Muslims are expelled from Lebanon, thus changing the social structure in Lebanon through the alliance with Israel. We in Syria sense this danger and we cannot allow it to become real, serious, and imminent.

Khaddam explained that everyone must realize the importance of Lebanon's geographic link with Syria. He affirmed that the agreement will not be implemented, and Syria will not allow it to become a reality that influences developments in the region, because Syria will not and cannot allow the extension of Camp David to Lebanon, and therefore to other Arab countries, thus encircling Syria, liquidating the Palestinian issue, and placing the region under Israeli domination.

Khaddam affirmed that the U.S.-Israeli draft agreement, which is intended to be imposed on Lebanon, is much worse than the two Camp David accords because the ties imposed on Lebanon according to this agreement were not imposed on Egypt according to the Camp David agreement.

Khaddam, Talas Brief Cabinet on Situation
JN161233 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1115 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] The Cabinet met at 1100 today with Prime Minister Dr 'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Kasm presiding.

At the outset of the meeting, the ministers observed a 1-minute silence in honor of the late Minister of Public Works and Water Resources Nayif Jarbu'. The prime minister spoke highly of the commendable, sincere, and constructive efforts the late minister had exerted during his lifetime and in his work at the ministry.

This was followed by a detailed briefing by 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, on the grave situation that reigns in the region and in Lebanon as a result of the U.S.-Israeli plan. In his briefing, Khaddam said that the Israeli-Lebanese draft agreement is a fruit of this plan and aims to deprive Lebanon of its Arab identity and entrench Israeli custodianship over Lebanon's policy, will, and land in an attempt to turn it into an area hostile to the Arab nation and its strategic interests, which are being meticulously defended by Syria, its people, and leadership in a real confrontation at this historical stage.

Khaddam then explained the various Arab and international contacts that had taken place and were still taking place for the sake of emphasizing Syria's position against the draft agreement and its objectives and against the Israeli occupation. These contacts demonstrated Syria's support for the Lebanese nationalist forces' struggle against attempts infringing on Lebanon's sovereignty, freedom and Arab sense of belonging. Furthermore, Syria, during the contacts, expressed its full readiness to use all means to abort every pressure and aggression.

At the end of Khaddam's address, Defense Minister General Mustafa Talas gave a detailed briefing on the military situation in Lebanon and the degree of Syria's prepardeness, adding that Syria owns broad potentials compatible with this preparedness — potentials bound to render the calculations of those planning to attack Syria difficult and even unattainable.

Following the defense minister's briefing on the military situation, the prime minister explained the guidelines of the domestic, Arab, and international situation, in terms of all its political, economic, and military aspects. The prime minister said that the Syrian position is backed by positive and qualitative factors on the domestic level, enjoys increasing popular support on the Arab level, and broad support by the friendly peoples, the Socialist countries, and the Soviet Union, which is firmly standing by Syria against its enemies.

Dr al-Kasm affirmed that this stage is one of responsibility, work, and commitment on the level of the people, party, and progressive front. This stage dictates that every citizen should demonstrate his vigilance and patriotism, and assume the best position required by Syria led by President Struggler Hafiz al-Asad.

When the prime minister concluded his briefing on the general situation and on the measures taken to intensify Syria's preparedness and confront all eventualities, the Cabinet discussed the various political, economic, and military realities. The Cabinet asserted Syria's remarkable role in confronting the U.S.- Israeli plan and the grave results of the draft agreement between Lebanon and Israel. This role, the Cabinet added, will be the axis of Arab struggle and of the Arab masses, which consider Syria the Arab force and the real defensive line of the Palestinian issue, Lebanon, and the Arabs. Syria represents the will of the Arab nation at this crucial stage.

People's Assembly Urges Lebanese To Foil Pact
JN151848 Damascus Domestic Television Service in Arabic 1730 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] The People's Assembly has condemned the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement being imposed on fraternal Lebanon under Israeli occupation and U.S. hegemony and urged members of the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies to close their ranks and apply pressure to foil this agreement, intensify the struggle for the complete withdrawal of the Israeli enemy, and avoid any decision that could be considered a mark of shame in the history of Lebanon.

The assembly held the first meeting in its sixth ordinary session tonight under Speaker Mahmud az-Zu'bi. 'Abd al-Qadir Qaddurah, deputy prime minister for economic affairs, and several Cabinet ministers attended the meeting.

At the start of the meeting, the members observed 1-minute ofsilence in mourning for the late minister Nayif Jarbu'. The speaker of the assembly then eulogized the late minister, praising his national and pan-Arab stands and his great services to the homeland. Legislative decrees issued by the president of the republic were then read and referred to the competent committees for study. The members' written questions were also read and referred to the competent quarters through the Prime Ministry.

Speaker Mahmud az-Zu'bi then spoke about the dangers and dimensions of the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement. He said: Our assembly has every right to discuss everything related to fraternal Lebanon's security, independence, and sovereignty and the dangers threatening it as a result of the Israeli military invasion. He added: This agreement, which is to be imposed on Lebanon, is a new invasion to legalize the military invasion. Our assembly, in discussing this grave situation and new plot today, proceeds from the common destiny and history of the two fraternal countries.

The speaker mentioned what Syria has done to safeguard Lebanon's sovereignty over its territory, save it from civil war, and defend it when the Israeli forces invaded its territories. He said: This agreement, in its clear provisions, will cut off every relationship between Lebanon and the Arab nation. It will also force the

Lebanese Chamber of Deputies to issue laws endorsing this estrangement.

Concluding, the speaker appealed to the fraternal Lebanese people and the members of the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies to close their ranks and forces to foil this agreement. He expressed his confidence that the Lebanese people can surmount this tribulation and secure their full right to sovereignty, independence, and freedom.

Press Commentaries View Draft Agreement

ATH-THAWRAH Commentary

JN140845 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0345 GMT 14 May 83

[Press review]

[Text] Under the headline "An Agreement for Withdrawal or One Under Which Lebanon Will Be Handed Over to Israel?" ATH-THAWRAH says: The Lebanese-Israeli-U.S. draft agreement is not an agreement for the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanon as the imperialist and Zionist media try to depict it but, on the contrary, is a draft agreement under which Lebanon will be handed over to Israel and be transformed into an Israeli protectorate whose burdens will not be shouldered by Israel.

This fact clearly emerges when reading the provisions of the draft agreement drawn up by the United States and Israel and which they seek to impose on Lebanon. It has become evident that Lebanon will not have absolute sovereignty over its territory and will have no sovereignty over the security zone, which is one-third of Lebanon's total area. Thus, Israel would be amputating the part of Lebanon in which it would have security arrangements and would be putting this area under the supervision of joint committees belonging to Lebanon, Israel, and the United States. In case differences occur, the United States will be the one to settle them and its decision will have the force of law, but this U.S. decision will only be an Israeli decision.

If we add to this what has been included in the provisions of the agreement, its addenda, and its explanatory minutes on the exchange of all security information between the Lebanese and Israeli forces, the cooperation of the Lebanese Navy with the Israeli Navy, and the establishment of an Israeli liaison bureau in Lebanon that will enjoy diploamtic immunity — the establishment of an Israeli Embassy in Lebanon without calling it an embassy — Israel is acheiving the objectives of its invasion of Lebanon and is placing Lebanon under its tutelage under the deceptive title of an agreement on withdrawa, while in fact, it is an agreement to hand over Lebanon to Israel.

The Arab people of Lebanon realize very well that this agreement will not bring peace. Proceeding from their militant history and their national and pan-Arab commitment, they will continue to confront Israel, repulse the invasion, and liberate Lebanon from the invasion and its results.

When Syria proclaims its categorical rejection of the contract of subservience, which Israel and the United States seek to impose on Lebanon, it is remaining loyal to its commitment of supporting the Lebanese people in their struggle against the invaders to liberate their land and foil the great dangers threatening Lebanon and harming the security of Syria and the Arab nation.

In another editorial, ATH-THAWRAH says: It is strange that the Lebanese-Israeli agreement equates the two sides' political integrity, when Israel is the aggressive invading country and Lebanon is the victim and vanquished. The preamble of the agreement speaks of the two sides' belief in and adherence to UN and international principles and charters as if it is intended to exonerate Israel of all the barbaric crimes and acts against the Lebanese people through the occupation of its land, destruction of its villages, and the annihilation of unarmed Palestinians in the well-known Sabra and Shatila massacres.

Thus, what logic equates the hangman and the victim? What custom or law can transform this equality into a political agreement? Israel seeks to show a new image of itself to the world, one that seeks peace and against whom all criticisms and accusations are untrue and unrealistic. Will the Lebanese people, who rejected what is taking place in the first place, commit perjury by supporting this historical falsehood? Will Lebanon, homeland, and people, agree to cleanse Israel's ugly visage before world public opinion after suffering a great deal from it?

Great hope is being pinned on the position of these people and their obstinate insistence on destroying all the bonds and agreements that are trying to usurp their national decision-making process and prevent them from exercising their Arab role in the struggle arena. This hope is very realistic because the Lebanese people realize, through their sound pan-Arab sense, that their suffering cannot be remedied by drawing the curtain on Israel's crimes and showing Israel its real views in a contradic k hyphenationtory manner.

AL-BA'TH Criticizes Agreement

JN151135 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0345 GMT 15 May 83

[Press review]

[Text] AL-BA'TH says: Several media quarters are competing to convince the Arab citizen to accept the Shultz deal inside and outside Lebanon and are vying to impose this deal on everyone. Just as the Zionist invading forces stormed the Lebanese territories 1 year ago and played havoc with the cities and villages of this fraternal country, the poisonous media are now launching an unjust campaign to impose certain convictions and achieve results the bayonets of the Zionist invaders could not impose.

If we go back to the agreement and discuss it proceeding from Lebanese considerations only and in accordance with the logic of introductions and conclusions, then what do we find? We find that the Lebanese negotiator who was considered a party to the conclusion of this agreement was not a negotiator in the true sense of the word, as acknowledged by international rules. The Lebanese negotiator was not free to negotiate. The Lebanese will was also not free and could not reject the principle of negotiations

or anything the other party imposed. The other party is actually represented by the Israeli and U.S. negotiators. In view of all laws and norms, anything that results from coercion does not count. Moreover, it is ultimately false.

We will not go far in counting causes for the absence of free will in the Lebanese negotiator. There are three matters that are very clear:

First, the Israeli occupation forces are present in a large part of the Lebanese territories and these forces exert pressure, particularly by fanning internal sedition and encouraging the sectarian fighting. An example of this is that when the Lebanese negotiator attempted, in one of the sessions, to oppose the Israeli negotiator and reject some of his terms, the head of the Israeli delegation said: Tomorrow, we will kill 10,000 persons in the mountain area and you will find yourselves faced with a problem in which 100,000 persons will be killed in Beirut and some other Lebanese cities. Is there any willpower in the face of such a threat?

Second, considerable U.S. pressure, being exerted against Lebanon, has not abated for one moment since the beginning of the negotiations. In fact, it reached its peak during the tour by Shultz, who brandished terror and threats in one hand and the false agreement in the other. Shultz' tour was accompanied by a feverish media campaign to allow him to tame the Lebanese and force them to sign the agreement of capitulation which he had previously prepared with the Tel Aviv leaders.

Third, the no-victor no-vanquished equation, which used to govern the Lebanese state, became imbalanced. The Zionist invasion first destroyed this equation and allowed the isolationist militias to do what they wanted, thus causing great disruption within the structure of the Lebanese forces. Consequently, the Lebanese party, which is collaborating with Israel, imposed its will on the rest of the parties in Lebanon. This destroyed the source of basic, legitimate decisionmaking by the Lebanese people and allowed a Lebanese party to deal high-handedly with this decision and make it conform to their previous stands and relations with the Zionist enemy. This can only result in the imposition of the Israeli conditions in the form of a deal which this party accepts and imposes on all the Lebanese through Israeli arms. This is what we see now on Lebanese territory.

AL-BA'TH concludes: In light of the Lebanese considerations, this agreement will not bring peace to Lebanon, as claimed by the mad media campaigns. It will bring only disaster, catastrophe, and bloodshed between the sons of one country, in light of the imbalanced equation that was originally established in Lebanon, because Israel will not remain idle as long as there is one person in Lebanon who raises his finger and says no to the occupation and to those who collaborate with it. Thus, the agreement is not only a matter of occupation, but is a form of repressive measure and terrorism carried out by a party that pledged to Washington and Tel Aviv that it would detach Lebanon from the Arab nation and convert it into a hamlet with which Israel behaves the way it likes and wants. This is why it is extremely urgent to increase the national influence in Lebanon and intensify the Lebanese and Arab efforts to foil the false U.S. deal and block the exits that bring in the poisonous winds. Syria will support, by all possible means, any effort inside and outside Lebanon that will foil this deal, work for its death, and burn its conclusions.

Further AL-BA'TH Criticism

JN160747 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0345 GMT 16 May 83

[From the press review]

[Text] In today's editorial headlined: "The Contract of Submission," AL-BA'TH writes: The regime in Lebanon, which has almost always declared it would not take any decision that runs counter to the will of the majority of the Lebanese people, has unilaterally embarked upon the gravest decision ever made by an Arab regime since the foundation of the Zionist entity.

It appears that despite broad popular opposition, the regime in Lebanon still insists on implementing the wishes of Washington and Tel Aviv, since this plot — the agreement — which was approved by the Lebanese Government the day before yesterday, was fully prepared by the U.S. Administration, which had its own role in Lebanon's invasion.

Continuing, AL-BA'TH says: Syria, which has copiously sacrificed for the sake of preserving Lebanon's unity and territorial integrity, will proceed with this course in response to the wishes of the majority of the Lebanese people and out of its commitments toward its pan-Arab principles — the principles that had been consolidated by Syria's great party and its Secretary General leader President Hafiz al-Asad. Leader Al-Asad, at his meeting with the Lebanese foreign minister last Friday, was very clear when he affirmed that the agreement, which was charted by the U.S. Administration, is grave and serious, particularly since this agreement was imposed on the fraternal country.

The paper adds: Syria, backed up by the Arab masses and by all the free and progressive forces in the world, and led by the USSR, will use all available means to halt the Arab collapse. In brief, whoever believes that the Arab masses will allow the emergence of a new As-Sadat will be grossly mistaken.

In conclusion, Syria's pan-Arab position toward Lebanon is not new. Syria had never left Lebanon alone to handle its ordeal. Syria will always consider any harm against Lebanon's sovereignty as one harming its own sovereignty. Syria will remain the hand that will defend Lebanon when it comes under attack or is threatened.

ATH-THAWRAH Commentary 15 May

JN151213 Damascus SANA in Arabic 0815 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] Damascus, 15 May (INA) — ATH-THAWRAH stated that the Lebanese-Israeli agreement will enable the Zionist wolf to enter the Lebanese coop and make Israel the party that will dominate and control Lebanon's fate and national will.

In its editorial today under the headline "The Agreement Will be a Gamble With Lebanon's Fate" ATH-THAWRAH says that the acceptance of the agreement will be a very grave gamble

with Lebanon's destiny and a kind of irresponsible political folly that would put Lebanon's destiny on a daredevil course.

ATH-THAWRAH warned that peddling the writ of capitulation will ignite a destructive civil war that would disrupt Lebanon's unity and cancel its existence as a country, people, and land. The paper adds that Lebanon would face difficult times if the agreement is concluded, and that an obscure future fraught with dangers will be waiting all those who contribute to peddling this shameful deal.

The paper stressed that many experiences in the region and the world have shown that capitulation and dealing with the enemy has always been a perilous course and has never brought glory, safety, or security. Lebanon still has enough time to abort this conspiracy and refrain from committing this national crime.

The paper hoped that logic and reason would triumph, that the pan-Arab sentiments would influence those who make decisions in Lebanon, and that Lebanon would overcome the difficult labor pains without losing its freedom, independence, and Arab affiliation.

ATH-THAWRAH concluded: History has taught us that capitulation to the invaders never brings honor and does not lead to freedom, and that victory cannot be wrested without sacrifice. Lebanon, which is standing at a crossroad, must choose the course of struggle for liberation, the expulsion of the Zionist invaders, and the purging of evil from the land of the Cedars. This is the only course that will achieve Lebanon's salvation and safety and will safeguard its indepdnence and existence.

IZVESTIYA Expresses Support

JN132018 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1815 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Tolkunov, director general of IZVESTIYA [name and title as heard], the mouthpiece of the Soviet Government, has reiterated the USSR's support for Syria's just struggle and the backing of Soviet public opinion on Syria's firm and continuing steadfastness against the Israeli aggression. He said: We are of the opinion that Syria's stand is the embodiment of struggle in establishing peace in the region, and is an expression of the Arab nation's interests. He added: We in the Soviet media support Syria's just struggle and wise policy on the accelerated events in the Middle East. We highly appreciate Syria's assistance to the Palestinian revolution.

This came during a meeting today between Tolkunov and Syrian Ambasssador in Moscow Muhammad 'Ali al-Halabi. Ambassador al-Halabi expressed Syria's appreciation of the position of the friendly Soviet Union and its political, economic, and military support.

Radio Commentary Condemns Draft Agreement

JN141602 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1115 GMT 14 May 83

[Station commentary]

[Excerpts] No doubt all those who wish Lebanon well, foremost among which is Syria, hope that the fraternal country succeeds in vacating the invading Israeli forces from Lebanon; that Lebanon regains its well-being, independence, and the control of all its territory; and that Lebanon resumes its natural role on the Arab arena. Needless to say, all those who wish Lebanon well must support every step to hastily vacate the Israeli invaders from Lebanon and erase all the effects bequeathed by the Zionist invasion, as well as all signs symbolizing this invasion and manifestations representing an extension of this invasion.

Syria — under all circumstances, and driven by the principles of its pan-Arab policy, by the geographical and historical ties, by the common fate, and by the unified sense of Arab belonging — proved that it stands by Lebanon, its freedom, independence, territorial integrity and Arab and humanitarian role. During the darkest days through which Lebanon had passed as a result of the U.S.-Israeli-As-Sadat plotting against the region — the plotting that drowned Lebanon with destruction, and ruination — the fraternal Lebanese people had only Syria which raced to help it, stop the bloodshed, and offer the aid to preserve Lebanon's territorial integrity and unity. Syria had never thought of asking favors in return for its aid to Lebanon. It was, rather, a fraternal duty dictated by the ties that link the two fraternal countries and by the close ties linking their national interests and security needs.

Syria will remain loyal to its commitments to Lebanon and its people. Likewise, Syria will remain loyal to all its pledges and is quite prepared to do everything necessary to liberate Lebanon from the Israeli occupation and the Israeli hegemonous schemes. But Syria's readiness to support Lebanon and defend its independence, unity of its people, future, and territorial integrity is one thing, and the support for the agreement that Israel and the United States want to impose on Lebanon — under the umbrella of U.S. pressure and extortion, and the bayonets, guns and aircraft of the Israeli occupation forces — is a completely different matter.

Syria has always said, and often reiterated, that it it prepared to withdraw its forces from Lebanon provided Israel withdraws its forces from Lebanon without any preset conditions, in accordance with UN Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509, and without Israel's achieving any gains.

Though the U.S. and Israeli sources are wickedly and diligently trying to depict the draft agreement between Lebanon and Israel as an agreement confined to the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from Lebanon, a reading of the provisions of this agreement,

which were only made public shortly before the date set by Israel and the United States to obtain Lebanon's signature, demonstrates the false image of the agreement depicted by the United States and Israel — just as false as the image of the Camp David accords: peace.

The draft agreement, which is meant to be imposed on Lebanon, does not insure the withdrawal of the invading Israeli forces from Lebanon; rather, it actually and practically places the entire south under the Israeli umbrella and makes it an extension of the Israeli security border which Begin, Shamir, and Sharon are demanding. Moreover, the draft agreement places the Lebanese forces in the south under the supervision of Israel and makes them Israeli border guards. Their only task is to secure protection of Israel — the task that Israel and its armies have so far failed to handle. The agreement, furthermore, opens up Lebanon to the Israeli presence, and closes it to the Arabs, who are resisting the Israeli occupation and aggression.

Despite the conditions the Israeli occupation helped create in Lebanon, no one can claim that he is authorized by the Lebanese people to speak alone for Lebanon. Likewise, no party, irrespective of its present status, can monopolize the representation of the higher Lebanese interests.

The structure on which Lebanon was founded, and on which Lebanon must depend it it wants to continue, is a structure dictating a real national unity comprising all parties and factions. Neglecting such a reality would place Lebanon at critical junctures and in a situation bound to threaten the components of its structure.

We would not be revealing a secret if we said that Lebanese parties, organizations, figures, and socially influential forces would not allow — regardless of the circumstances — Lebanon to turn into a U.S. state or an Israeli protectorate or a staging base for launching aggression and plotting against Syria and the Arab nation.

It is in the interest of Lebanon and the Arabs that the Lebanese officials are taking heed of President Al-Asad's appeals to avoid a pitfall where Israel would become Lebanon's official ally instead of Lebanon remaining in the Arab fold.

Also, it is in the interest of Lebanon and the Arabs that courage be the trait of the struggle to liberate Lebanon from the invaders and occupation forces and not in surrendering to U.S. pressure and Israeli blackmail.

Further Commentary
JN131508 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1115 GMT 13 May 83

[Station commentary]

[Text] The United States and Israel are putting increasing pressure on Lebanon to complete Shultz' plan, which will open the way for the aggressive designs against the Arab region. Although Arab Syria has defined its stand, revealed the objectives and inplications of this plan, and described it as a capitulatory contract in the interest of Israel, there are some forces that insist on forcing the Lebanese Government to sign the draft agreement and turn the plan from words on paper into realities on Lebanon's natural map. Although we do not intend to mention these forces by name, hoping they will reconsider their position, we affirm that loyalty to Lebanon should encourage all the honorable forces to foil the draft agreement, and prevent signing it and putting it into effect.

What is the meaning of accepting such a plan, which will allow the Israeli enemy to send its troops, open the border for movement of persons and goods, and give this enemy the right to appoint people to positions? Is this not an occupation of Lebanon; an imposition of the enemy's will on it; a blow to its independence; a violation of its sovereignty, freedom, and dignity?

Syria is revealing the contents of the draft agreement not only to safeguard its national security, but also to maintain the historical, fraternal ties between Syria and fraternal Lebanon. Nobody can ignore these ties. Foiling the draft agreement is a necessity dictated by the pan-Arab interest and the inevitable confrontation of the Zionist enemy to resolve the Palestine question on the basis of justice and recognition of the Palestinian right to self-determination and an independent state on their national soil.

Hence, we can understand what is encouraging the Israeli enemy to prepare for a large-scale aggression against Syria following the latter's rejection of the draft agreement. This agreement is a blow to Lebanon's independence, freedom, and sovereignty. At the same time, it is a blow to the Palestinian people's right to set up their state and determine their destiny. Israel and its American supporters want to divide the pan-Arab cause so they can impose their will on each state separately. Israel wants to convert Lebanon into a base for its forces to deal a blow to Syria and its Armed Forces, and a gateway for its goods, spies, and agents to reach all parts of the Arab region. The final results of the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement will be more dangerous than its contents. It is based on the traditional game, which Israel has been practicing for 35 years — a game in which the latest Zionist accomplishments abrogate Arab talk about any previous gains. Is there not a a lesson in this?

Al-Asad Receives Lebanese National Figures
JN151135 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1115 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] At 1300 today President Hafiz al-Asad received a delegation of the Lebanese nationalist leaders comprising Progressive Socialist Party leader Walid Junblatt; George Hawi, secretary general of the Central Committee of the Lebanese Communist Party; Mahmud 'Abd al-Khaliq, deputy leader of the Syrian National Social Party; Riyadh Ra'd; George Habar; and Comrade 'Asim Qansuh, secretary of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party Organization in Lebanon.

The discussion dealt with the situation in the region, particularly in the Lebanese arena.

Palestine Broadcast on Bridge Crossing Measures
JN152046 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 15 May 83

[Palestine Broadcast: from "On the Events" program]

[Text] The Jordanian Cabinet will meet in Amman today to discuss the adoption of special measures to tighten the control on movement between the West and East Banks. A Jordanian source has said that these measures will be presented next week to the Occupied Territories Affairs Committee of the Jordanian National Consultative Council in preparation for approval and implementation.

Political observers in the region have linked the measures, which the Amman government intends to adopt against the West Bank citizens, with the failure of all the attempts to make the PLO authorize the king of Jordan to represent our Palestinian people in negotiations with the Zionist entity on the basis of the Reagan plan.

Observers referred to an announcement 2 days ago that efforts are being exerted to form a popular front in the occupied West Bank and Gaza. The observers asserted that these new Jordanian measures are aimed to increase pressure on the Palestinians, especially in the occupied territories, so they will openly announce their support for the efforts made by the Jordanian king, who wants to negotiate with the Zionist entity, and declare their opposition to the PLO's position and the resolutions adopted by the PNC which rejected the Reagan plan in part and parcel.

Khaddam Confers With CSSR Officials 16 May
JN161530 Damascus SANA in Arabic 1440 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Damascus, 16 May (SANA) — 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, this afternoon received Stanislav Svoboda, CSSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, and the accompanying delegation. The talks dealt with the current political situation in the Middle East and bilateral relations.

Delegations Hold Talks
JN161542 Damascus SANA in Arabic 1450 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Damascus, 16 May (SANA) — a Syrian delegation under Assistant Foreign Minister Rashid al-Kilani and a CSSR delegation under Stanislav Svoboda, CSSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, held and official session of talks here today. The CSSR ambassador attended the talks.

The two sides discussed bilateral relations and stressed the importance of consolidating these relations in the interest of the two friendly countries, given that they are confronting the same enemy, U.S. imperialism and Zionism.

The two sides also reviewed the situation in the Middle East. Their viewpoints proved to be identical, particularly on the Lebanese-U.S.-Israeli agreement and the threats that it poses to the security of Lebanon, Syria, and the Arab nation.

Agreement Signed After Knesset Approves Accord

Knesset Debate Reported

TA161817 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1705 GMT 16 May 83

[Excerpts] We have been waiting for a message from the Knesset. Here it is:

By a majority of 57 votes by coalition members — despite the abstention of all the Alignment faction members — the Knesset in Jerusalem has just approved the agreement with Lebanon. Ministers 'Ari'el Sharon and Yuval Ne'eman did not go to the voting, and the two other Tehiya faction members — Hanan Porat and Ge'ula Kohen — voted against the agreement. Our correspondent Arye Golan reports from the Knesset:

[Golan — live] Is the peace agreement with Lebanon which was presented to the Knesset today identical to the cease-fire agreement with that country that was signed back in 1949? That is the question that caused tempers to rise here this evening. Yosi Sarid, Dov Zakin, and other Alignment members claimed there is nothing new in the agreement and no achievement in it. Lebanon already promised not to attack from its territory after the war of independence.

Defense Minister Moshe Arens, who concluded today's debate, replied: That is not true.

Sarid agitated for a few minutes until he obtained the text of the old cease-fire agreement. But when he tried to read several clauses from it to prove his points, he met with vigorous, vocal, and sharp opposition from Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir, his deputy Yehuda Ben-Me'ir, and MK Roni Milo. Mr Speaker, Minister Shamir called out, there is no precedent that at the end of a minister's speech he is asked a question.

There is a chance the agreement with Lebanon will mean progress and an important contribution to Israel's security and safety, the defense minister said. We would do well to sign it, he said.

[Begin Arens recording] Whoever listened to the debate, particularly to the opposition's remarks, could have gained the impression that we had already signed dozens of political agreements with Arab countries — that we do this every Monday and Thursday, that we had already become tired of these agreements and of these debates, and that, in fact, we dismiss the importance of a political debate with an Arab country. [end recording]

Whoever is going to abstain from voting, Professor Arens told the Alignment members, is really saying he does not know what to do, or perhaps he has other reasons, as though cutting off his nose to spite his face. But Yitzhaq Rabin, who spoke before the defense minister, said: I will not vote against the agreement because in the circumstances that have been created, it is the best of a bad job. And I will also be able to support it [phrase as heard], Rabin continued, because it is an expression of the failure of a concept to which I am opposed.

[Begin Rabin recording] I hope the lesson will be learned that delusions of the concept of using the IDF's military strength to achieve far-reaching political goals — that argument about it is over. It has failed. The argument is over that it is impossible with a military operation to eliminate once and for all Arab terrorism. To the same extent, there is a point in a military action to achieve restricted goals, immediate security, and direct ones. I hope that this really has been learned, but the failure hurts. It hurts and burns not only the government; it is the failure of us all. [end recording]

The Alignment faction actually abstained in the voting. Ministers Sharon and Ne'eman were absent during the voting. Tehiya voted against the agreement, but it won the Knesset's approval by a majority of 57 coalition members' votes and those of Shinuy. The Knesset has approved the agreement with Lebanon.

Rabin, Arens Debate Speeches

TA162023 Jerusalem Domestic Television Service in Hebrew 1900 GMT 16 May 83

[Report by Hayim Yavin on 16 May Knesset debate with recorded excerpts — videotaped]

[Excerpt] [MK Yitzhaq Rabin — intercepted in midsentence] ...the Soviets and the Syrians with a common policy have already made, in my opinion, an impressive achievement. They have stopped the peace process. They have prevented Jordan from joining the peace talks, and by this they may have put the lid on a continuation of the peace process on the basis of the Camp David agreements.

Today the veto on the solution in Lebanon is in Syrian-Soviet hands, and I will not be surprised if, in view of the military Soviet-Syrian edge, for their own political objectives, Syria and the Soviet Union do not need to open fire in order to achieve the veto on the U.S. attempt to renew the peace progress.

[Yavin] Defense Minister Moshe Arens, in his answering remarks, introduced a change into the atmosphere of overwhelming criticism that had prevailed for the 8 hours of the debate against the government and its ministers. In a voice that was to the point — quiet but firm — he concentrated on what was on the agenda: the agreement, and nothing else. Anyone who is opposed to the agreement, Arens said, is as much as saying they prefer to stay in Lebanon without an agreement. If the Syrians do not leave after there is an agreement, our situation will be better than if they stay in Lebanon without an agreement. Whoever abstains, Arens said, simply does not know what to do in the current situation.

The defense minister called — wholeheartely, as he put it — for signing in the belief that this is an important step in the peace process in our region, and a good chance for serious political progress for Israel and for its safety.

[Arens — picked up in midsentence] ... Government of Lebanon. Every one of you must ask himself the question: If the agreement — the situation — is so good for the Syrians, so good for the

Russians, why are they doing all they can to torpedo it? Why are they doing all they can for it not to be signed?

If they had been able to influence us here, they would have done all they could for it not to be supported here, and I do not always agree with the Soviet way of looking at the situation in the Middle East, but it seems to me that this time they are reading the map correctly. Mr Speaker, I think that there is a good chance that this agreement represents political progress important to Israel — important to Israel from the aspect of its security, and important to Israel from the aspect of its safety.

We are signing with an Arab country a political agreement, with Lebanon — the Arab country in which there is a pluralistic [last word in English] society, in which many of its sects have a genuine common interest with Israel. This is a country which could be a bridge to the Arab world. And so I recommend to all members of the house that we sign the agreement, and to those who are today in a pessimistic mood I wish us — you — that when we meet in another year and make a judgment on this agreement, we will all see that it is a very appreciable achievement for the State of Israel's security and political policy. [end videotape]

Signing Ceremonies Begin

TA171034 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1000 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] The second signing ceremony for the agreement between Israel and Lebanon is beginning now. Representatives of the two countries signed the agreement in Khaldah this morning, and the U.S. representative signed as a witness.

After the ceremony, Israeli delegation leader David Kimche told our correspondent Me'ir Einstein that Israel has been promised that international pressure would now be applied to Syria to get it to accept the agreement. U.S. Ambassador Morris Draper stated that he is sure that the objective of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon will ultimately be achieved.

Kimche, Fattal on Agreement

TA170825 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0800 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] The signing ceremony for the agreement between Israel and Lebanon is continuing in Khaldah now. At the beginning of the session, David Kimche said that we are trying to achieve peace with Lebanon, and that the agreement is only the beginning. He stated that Israel proved its commitment to peace when it withdrew from the Sinai, and it will also carry out the agreement with Lebanon. He said that both sides are assuming risks, but that they also stand to gain from the agreement.

Kimche thanked the United States for its mediation efforts, and called on the president of Syria to prove his desire to restore Lebanon's independence and territorial integrity by withdrawing his army from the country.

Lebanese delegation head Antoine Fattal said the agreement was intended to end 8 years of war and anarchy in his country, and to ensure the withdrawal of all foreign forces. He stressed that Lebanon wants to base its policy on moderation and distance itself from wars and provocations.

Shamir on Accord, Understanding with U.S.

TA170627 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0505 GMT 17 May 83

[Interview with Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir by Arye Golan on 17 May; place not given]

[Text] [Question] This morning, Lebanon said the agreement means neither peace nor normalization, and Foreign Minister Elie Salim said in the Lebanese Parliament that the agreement will take effect only after Syria and the PLO withdraw or decide to withdraw their forces from Lebanon. Are these remarks acceptable to us?

[Answer] We are familiar with and know the constraints affecting the Lebanese Government at this critical moment for Lebanon, and for relations between Israel and Lebanon, and between Israel and its neighbors. It is clear the agreement we have signed is not a formal peace treaty. However, it contains many elements of a peace treaty, and there is no doubt that this agreement is a stage on the way to a full peace treaty between Israel and Lebanon.

As for all the other aspects of Israeli-Lebanese relations, there is no doubt that if matters develop positively, we will achieve normal bilateral relations. From our point of view, today's event has additional importance: It is a necessary stage along the path to ending the war in Lebanon.

[Question] Mr Minister, this afternoon you and Ambassador Samuel Lewis are going to sign the memorandum of understanding with the United States. Can you tell us or give us a hint as to the contents of the understanding? Is it true that the aircraft are expected to be released — embargoed F-16's?

[Answer] The agreement I am going to sign today concerns only the situation in Lebanon and our relations with Lebanon, and expresses U.S. guarantees and U.S. involvement in the arrangement of all matters concerning relations between Israel and Lebanon, and the ending of the state of war in Lebanon. Naturally, it is an important stage in the improvement of U.S.-Israeli relations. This improvement will be manifest soon, we hope, in steps...

[Question — interrupting] Practical steps also, such as the lifting of the embargo?

[Answer] We hope so.

[Question] In conclusion, with your permission, I would like to go back to the long political discussion in the Knesset yesterday. At the end of that discussion, you vigorously opposed the request by MK Yosef Sarid — which was approved by Knesset Speaker Savidor — in which Sarid wanted to read the 1949 armistice agreement and show that the two agreements are similar. Why were you so vigorously opposed, Mr Foreign Minister?

[Answer] I opposed allowing — unprecedented in the Knesset — a Knesset member to ask further questions [of the speaker], thus provoking heckling after the conclusion of a prolonged and important political discussion. As for the subject itself — the similarity between the armistice agreement and the agreement being signed today between Israel and Lebanon — I must say that anyone who is familiar with these two agreements knows that the difference between them is very great and essential. There are dozens of essential differences between the 1949 armistice agreement's clauses and the agreement we are signing today.

Arens Interviewed on Syria, Lebanon War

TA131039 Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew 13 May 83 p 13

[Interview with Defense Minister Moshe Arens by Dov Goldstein: "The Soviets' Evacuation From Beirut is One of the Signs We Picked Up About Vigorous Preparatory Moves in Syria Toward a War Alert" — date and place not given]

[Excerpts] [Goldstein] The former defense minister, Mr Ari'el Sharon, has set himself at the head of those who claim that the agreement between Israel and Lebanon leaves an "open door to terrorism." Are you convinced that he is wrong?

[Arens] We are surrounded by Arab countries. Not one of them resembles Norway, France, or the United States. What typifies them is instability. Some of them at least still adhere to a demonstrative and avowed hostility to Israel. All of them host on their territory a PLO presence of one sort or another, and all of them, in one way or another, support the PLO interests.

In such a situation, which has already lasted for a long time, I would not say that there is any arrangement whatsoever, of any type, on our northern border or any other of our borders about which we can say with confidence that this arrangement guarantees us against terrorist acts, attacks against our settlements, and harm to our citizens. In contrast to this, I can say with confidence that terrorist groups from the various PLO branches will try in the future, as they tried in the past, ceaselessly, to carry out acts of terrorism and damage targets in Israel.

What we have achieved in the agreement with Lebanon, in the argument with the United States, is first of all a change in the political situation; and it seems to me that there is not enough understanding and awareness here of this change. We have already had experience in the past of security zones of all types, and not one of them stood up to the test and prevented the necessity for operations and wars. We had the strip before the Litani Campaign. It did not stop the Peace for Galilee war. We have almost all come to the conclusion that a security strip in southern Lebanon and its breadth is almost unimportant, does not solve the problem, and does not absolve us from the need to go out again and again on military, warlike campaigns.

What would be required and essential for us would be a political change: To put an end to the state of war between Israel and Lebanon which has been in existence for 35 years, since the establishment of Israel. That change has been achieved in the current agreement: an end has been put — in statements and in writing — to the state of war between Israel and Lebanon.

There are people — and this has been said by Labor Party Chairman Shim'on Peres — who claim that there is no great difference between a situation of a cease-fire and an end to the state of war between the two countries, the existence of which was repeatedly declared by Lebanon. The Lebanon authorities permitted the PLO to consolidate itself in Lebanon in accordance with the famous "Cairo declaration," and permitted it to act against Israel and its citizens from southern Lebanon. This time, with the current arrangement, with the cancellation of the state of war, Lebanon is committing itself to prevent hostile actions against Israel from Lebanese territory. It is also binding itself to prevent the entry of military forces hostile to Israel or even military forces from countries that have no diplomatic relations with Israel.

[Goldstein] Do you trust these commitments by the Government of Lebanon, which hardly rules Beirut?

[Arens] What this commitment means is that if there are actions against Israel, or if Lebanon permits the infiltration of forces hostile to Israel and lets them get organized in contrast to its commitment, according to the agreement, these will be clear violations of the agreement and will permit Israel to act in accordance with its right to self-defense.

There are people who say that the Government of Lebanon will not be strong enough to keep the agreement, and stand up to the commitment that it has taken upon itself in accordance with the agreement. The truth is that nobody can say whether it will be strong enough, and nobody can claim that we have full confidence in this. This is precisely why we have not put our fate into the hands of the rulers in Lebanon, but included a series of security components in the agreement.

We will have full supervision in southern Lebanon, including joint patrols with the Lebanese Army on a daily basis. The IDF will keep its finger on the pulse of everything that occurs in southern Lebanon. We will know at the right time about any hostile organization in the area, and we will be able to act against it and foil it before it goes into operation.

[Goldstein] That sounds very good: both a political change, the right to act according to the rules of self-defense, supervision, and the discovery of any organizing in advance and action against any such organization. Major General Tamir claims that these are just the things that Mr Sharon obtained in negotiations with Lebanon several months ago. Why, in your estimation, is he so opposed to them at present?

[Arens] Well, that is something you should ask him. Perhaps he had expectations which there is no possibility of actualizing. Every Israeli — not only Mr Sharon — is certainly saying to himself that if we were able to dictate the conditions we would like and arrange relations with Lebanon as we would like them, we would certainly demand full peace with Lebanon, and demand that the IDF be able to act inside Lebanese territory, and other such achievements. That is what we would like. But everyone understands — and I hope that Arik Sharon also understands — that this is only by way of being what we would

like, and is under no circumstances the reality. These are conditions we were unable to reach, and unable to actualize. We could, perhaps, have grabbed a section of Lebanon and worked from within it and ruled as we wished inside it, but it is absolutely clear that this would have led to a furor in the political field.

We looked for the golden mean along which we will arrive at political relations with Lebanon, and be able to cooperate with it on the basis of the common Israeli-Lebanese desire to stop the terrorists return to southern Lebanon. We will also have the right means to stop hostile organization and foil it if the Lebanese do not keep their part of the agreement. I think that we have found that golden mean.

[Goldstein] How do the security arrangements that have been agreed upon guarantee peace for Galilee when it is clear that the joint patrols are not a military factor that can prevent attacks against Israel, and only two Lebanese brigades should do this? These are not the forces that can be relied upon to foil attempts to attack Israel. These are forces whose role is supervision and accumulating intelligence data. The arrangements are such that we will know every day and every night what is happening in the field, what is being worked out, what is being plotted, and if terrorist action against us is being built up in the area. Without knowing about those getting organized, it is impossible to foil the organizations and attacks. We have obtained this condition on the basis of the Government of Lebanon's commitment to prevent any organization and attack against Israel from its territory.

When we get to know about such organizing and we find out that the Government of Lebanon is incapable of preventing it, it will be legitimate for us to act with our force, on the basis of the agreement with Lebanon. We will not sit back with folded arms if what we do not want to happen and do not agree to begins happening again in Lebanon: terrorists getting organized.

[Goldstein] Israeli soldiers are still being hurt in Lebanon. Public protest and definite evidence of impatience and anger have recently increased. What effect did this have on the government's decision to approve the agreement with Lebanon, despite all the doubts and question marks?

[Arens] This had no effect on the government decision, and it must not have any effect whatsoever. It is true that here and there various people are initiating protest actions of this type or encouraging or fostering them, in the hope of weakening the government's ability to stand firm in the negotiations, and damaging the chance of obtaining security conditions that we need. It is difficult for me to believe that there are such people, but it is absolutely clear — and it seems to me that it is clear to everyone that these things must have absolutely no effect on the government or push the decisionmakers into agreeing to something that is not good for Israel.

If we were to behave in this way, the other side would build its policy on this weakness, and we have less chance of achieving what is vital for us. I am now hearing claims that the agreement is not sufficiently good for Israel. Let this be clear: We would not have obtained even this if we had taken this phenomenon of impatience and public protest into account.

[Goldstein] It is clear, then, that in the final analysis these expressions of displeasure and the repeated demands to leave Lebanon will not weaken the government's bargaining ability?

[Arens] No! Certainly not! Every Israeli can answer himself with satisfaction that the government's ability to stand firm has not been weakened by these phenomena.

[Goldstein] What importance did Israel's desire to please the United States, and improve relations with it have on Israel's adopting this agreement?

[Arens] When the government decides to adopt an agreement and sign it, the considerations are based on a broad spectrum of Israeli interests which are examined one by one, pro and con, until the decision is made. There are many components in this spectrum, and Israel's relations with the United States certainly are a valuable component in the spectrum. But this spectrum is under no circumstances the dominant [last word in English] one. The dominant component is Israel's relations with Lebanon, the situation in Lebanon, and its influence on the security of the north of Israel. No other consideration — not even Israeli-U.S. relations — even approaches this one.

[Goldstein] Does Israel now have any interest in reviving the memorandum of strategic understanding with the United States, and has this been promised in talks with George Shultz in Jerusalem?

[Arens] That memorandum was no more than a formal framework for the deep, broad fabric of relations between Israel and the United States. These relations can be maintained and even expanded without such a formal framework. I see no necessity to return to the same memorandum. If the United States were to initiate a revival of the memorandum, we would relate to its initiative and be prepared to discuss it.

[Goldstein] Is there no point in any initiative of our own?

[Arens] No. The agreement must be bilateral. It must be based on the Americans' desire to maintain it. They must initiate it. The nature of our relations with the United States is not affected by the absence of such a formal framework, and I do not see any reason for us to initiate a discussion about its renewal with the United States.

[Goldstein] And this was not discussed with Shultz?

[Arens] No.

[Goldstein] Is the claim true that the government knew in advance that the Soviet Union and Syria did not intend to agree to the evacuation of the Syrian forces from Lebanon, and so it approved the agreement on the assumption that it was desirable for the relations between Israel and the United States — and in any case the Syrians would torpedo the agreement, and Israel would not have to evacuate the IDF from Lebanon?

[Arens] No. Not true. We did not know in advance. We do not know that now, and I do not think there is anyone in the Westernworld who knows whether the Soviets will encourage the

Syrians to stay, or what Syria will do. It may be that the Syrians themselves have not yet decided about their next moves. What we did know in advance — and we were not mistaken — is that the agreement that has been achieved would please neither the Soviets nor the Syrians.

There certainly is here a weakening of the positions of the Soviet Union and Syria in the Middle East. We also knew that the Soviets and the Syrians would make attempts to torpedo the agreement in order to stop the Government of Lebanon from signing it.

[Goldstein] Is it clear that the positions of the Soviet Union and Syria will be identical in any event, or do the Syrians still have the ability to decide without being given orders from the Soviet Union?

[Arens] The positions will not necessarily be identical. But there is a definite mutual influence between the pair. The Syrians take the Soviet Union's interests into account, because they depend on it. There is a symmetry [last word in English] in these relations. The Soviets also take Syria's position into account and are influenced by it. I would not go so far as to say that the Soviets can dictate their own position to the Syrians, one unacceptable to Syria.

[Goldstein] What is your estimation? Will the Syrians agree to evacuate Lebanon or not?

[Arens] I do not know. But the following evaluation can be made: The first thing the agreement does is to remove legitimization from the Syrian presence in Lebanon. In the past, the Syrians claimed vigorously and firmly that they were in Lebanon absolutely legitimately, and their army had been invited there by the legal ruler in Lebanon. They placed a strong and constant emphasis on the legitimacy of their presence.

The agreement cancels this legitimacy. According to the agreement, the legal Lebanese authorities will demand that the Syrians leave Lebanon. At that moment, the Syrians will no longer be able to envelop themselves in the claim of legitimacy. Their presence in Lebanon will be much less comfortable. They will have to weigh whether they prefer the IDF to remain in Lebanon as well as their presence, an IDF close to Syrian strategic targets including Damascus, or whether they prefer to leave Lebanon so that the IDF also leaves. I estimate that the answer to this question is still unclear even to the Syrians. They have not closed the door, and have not declared unambiguously that their position will be this or the other.

[Goldstein] How will Israel react if the Syrians refuse to evacuate Lebanon?

[Arens] I would not like to go into detail at this stage. We would consult with the Lebanese and the Americans. We are preparing various plans for this contingency. This is a problem common to Lebanon, us, and the Americans and we will try to deal with it together.

[Goldstein] Are the reports that thousands of terrorists have recently crossed the Syrian-Lebanese border and located themselves in the Al-Biqa' region true

[Arens] There has been a certain passage of terrorist groups from Syria into Lebanon, some of them to the Al-Biqa' and some of them toward the territory held by the Christians in northern Lebanon.

[Goldstein] In serious numbers?

[Arens] Not serious from the aspect of their military power compared with that of the IDF.

[Goldstein] What does this infiltration indicate?

[Arens] Something very clear. Both the PLO, the Syrians, and the Soviets are now doing all they can in a campaign of frightening Lebanon, to stop it from signing the agreement achieved with Israel. These elements — the PLO, the Syrians, and the Soviets — and this may come as a surprise to Mr Peres and the other Israeli opponents of the agreement — regard the agreement as a great achievement for Israel, and are treating it accordingly and doing everything to stop us. The terrorists' infiltration into Lebanon should be seen as part of the campaign to frighten Lebanon. Although — and this should always be said — we cannot now know clearly whether there is no more far-reaching intention here, we are alert to all the possibilities.

[Goldstein] Israel has agreed that Major Haddad will no longer act as a commander of his Lebanese militia in southern Lebanon. Nor will he be the commander of the Lebanese Army in that area. Is this not abandoning a friend who has fought together with Israel against Palestinian terrorism for the last 8 years?

[Arens] Abandoning Haddad?! People do not know what they are talking about! First of all, Maj Haddad's post (and I hope that the Lebanese will promote him, he has already been a major for a very long time, and the time in grade in the IDF has already passed) has not yet been specifically and finally defined. We hope to speak with the Lebanese on this issue. However, while previous Lebanese Governments — even that headed by President Sarkis — put Haddad on trial in his absence, and accused him of betrayal and desertion, now there is a willingness by the Lebanese Government and the Lebanese Army to bring him back into the ranks of the army as an officer who played a key role in southern Lebanon for the Lebanese Army and within its framework.

It is impossible to forget that Haddad is a Lebanese patriot. If he wanted to live in Israel and join the IDF, there would be no problem. But he wants — and rightly so — to live in Lebanon and serve in the Lebanese Army. In August 1982, at my meeting with Bashir al-Jumayyil in Beirut about 3 weeks before his murder (I was then the Israeli ambassador to the United States), Bashir told me that after he was elected president of Lebanon he would not, under any circumstances, be able to leave Haddad in southern Lebanon, but would send him to serve as military attache in Washington. That is not the situation at present. The Lebanese Government and the Lebanese Army are prepared to leave Haddad in southern Lebanon and give him a key post inpreventing terrorists from getting organized, and foiling their plots against Israel. There has, therefore, been a significant change in Haddad's status.

I hope the Lebanese will get to know Haddad as we have gotten to know him: a good, courageous, and loyal officer. I hope he will reach senior positions in the Lebanese Army, for the benefit of Lebanon and for the benefit of Israel.

There has been no abandoning. There have, perhaps, been people among us who believed that we could dictate to Lebanon who its chief of staff would be, and who the senior officers in its army in southern Lebanon and other areas would be. It is impossible to base political relations between two countries on such an attempt to dictate such things to another country.

[Goldstein] Do you not, really and truly, fear that leaders of other minorities in the Middle East may be deterred in the future from any binding link with Israel, because they know that at the testing time Israel does not keep faith with its friends?

[Arens] No. Lebanon is a country of minorities. The entire Middle East and most of the countries of the world understand what circles in Israel do not understand, or do not want to admit in public — that this country that is composed of minorities has acquired its renewed independence and sovereignty as a direct result of an Israeli military action, and that Lebanon is prepared to found its future path on a political agreement between Israel and Lebanon.

[Goldstein] If despite the security arrangements terrorist action is renewed from Lebanese territory, is there an understanding and an agreement between Israel and the United States that the IDF is permitted to act in Lebanon to eliminate the terrorism?

[Arens] The agreement states this specifically. In the agreement, Lebanon guarantees to prevent any type of terrorism against Israel. Nonprevention of terrorism — and it makes no difference from where — is a clear violation of the agreement. When you add the supervisory capability we have achieved to this legal side, it is clear that we will know what is happening in southern Lebanon. And if it happens, we have the legal basis to act when action is needed.

[Goldstein] I asked whether there is agreement with the Americans on this matter ....

[Arens] We have held many talks with the Americans, and one of the issues we discussed at great length was about the military ability of the Lebanese and their security services to prevent the terrorists' return to Lebanon and threats to Israel. A Lebanon clean of Syrian forces is, of course, a different Lebanon. There is no doubt at all that even to such a Lebanon (if there really is to be such), the terrorists will try to return.

[Goldstein] Did the representatives of the Government of Israel and the U.S. Government have one view about the ability of the Lebanese?

[Arens] No. There were different evaluations. The most optimistic were the Lebanese themselves. We were the most skeptical and realistic. The Americans were in the middle. There was no doubt about the Lebanese desire to prevent the terrorists' return to Lebanon. This desire is valuable. The Lebanese understand that the terrorists' return is the end of Lebanon as an independent state.

[Goldstein] The Soviets' evacuation from Cairo and Damascus before the Yom Kippur war turned out to be a move preceding a war. At that time, Israel did not take that hint as seriously as it should have done. How is Israel now taking the evacuation of the Soviet's families from Beirut? Is this a sign of war?

[Arens] The evacuation is one of many signs we have been picking up over the last few weeks, indicating that war is possible. With the aid of the Soviets, there are broad and vigorous processes of preparation for war in Syria. As to whether these processes are a preparation to absorb a blow from us — the Syrians think they can expect this — or are intended to strike a blow at us, we have no answer at this stage.

I would only add that the distance between the two processes — the two goals — is not great, and I estimate that the Syrians themselves have not yet decided which direction to follow. But the heating up of the atmosphere and the tension accompanying it exist among the Syrian forces, both in Lebanon and in Syria. At this stage, at least, the evacuation from Beirut is not being accompanied by an evacuation from Damascus. It may be that the evacuation from Beirut is also part of the "campaign of frightening" that the Soviets and Syrians are conducting against the Government of Lebanon.

[Goldstein] And if not? If the Soviets are again repeating a previous prewar move, as they did in October 1973?

[Arens] We are prepared for this possibility. We are not interested in war. We want to reach peaceful relations with Syria. But if Al-Asad decides to go to war, he will be very disappointed with its results.

[Goldstein] If, heaven forbid, war breaks out with Syria, is massive Soviet involvement in it expected, beyond what we knew in previous wars?

[Arens] Either they have decided on this in the Kremlin and forgotten to inform us, or they have not yet decided. I believe that the Russians have also not yet decided. The potential [last word in English] exists. There is increased Soviet presence in Syria. In many ways it reminds us of the Soviet presence in Egypt during the war of attrition. I assume that the Soviets will also think twice before they create a situation in which there would be active participation in war by their officers and men.

[Goldstein] Will the Americans warn the Soviets against military intervention?

[Arens] I assume that the Americans are not pleased with the Soviet presence in Syria, and they would not be happy to see their intervention in a war. They will do all they can to deter the Soviets from such a development and prevent it.

[Goldstein] Now comes the question of the hand on the heart....

[Arens] My heart or yours?

[Goldstein] Your heart. Hand on heart. If you had known in June

1982 that these would be the results of the war, would you have recommended that Israel go to war in Lebanon?

[Arens] Look, nobody who goes to war knows how to predict its results. If you review Israel's wars — and they have been many; they come to six — then you can say about each of them that at the beginning we did not know what their end result would be. But the genuine question I must answer is: Did we have any alternative? Was it possible not to go to war? That is a question that must be answered, even when one already knows what the current result of the war is.

This is not yet the last word in relations between Israel and Lebanon. And so I am only speaking about the current result. The answer to this question is unambiguous. There was no alternative! Without a shadow of a doubt, there was none! No government could have put up with the situation in which its citizens had found themselves for 3 years before the war, with thousands of terrorists across the border, armed with quantities of weapons, far more than had been assumed prior to that. The entire population in the north of Israel was a hostage in the hands of the terrorists. No sovereign country in the world could accept such a situation. No country in the world — including the United States or Mexico — has put up with such a situation. And today, too, if the United States or France or England were to face such a situation, they would act immediately very similarly to the IDF action in the Peace for Galilee war. Had Israel not acted in this way, its government would have been evading its basic responsibility for the security of its citizens.

[Goldstein] When will the agreement with Lebanon be signed?

[Arens] I hope very soon. There is a tendency in Israel to sneer at Lebanon in comparison with other Arab countries. But Lebanon is the only Arab country which has a nontotalitarian regime. The government there has to bring the agreement to parliament for ratification, and I hope that this will be done rapidly and without disturbances.

[Goldstein] How long will the IDF withdrawal last?

[Arens] This involves a simultaneous withdrawal by us, the Syrian Army, and the terrorists. We will not begin to withdraw until after the Israeli prisoners and missing are returned to us. After all the stumbling blocks are removed, the IDF withdrawal will take between 2 and 3 months.

Haddad Sees 'War of Independence' With Syria

TA151914 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1900 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] Major Sa'd Haddad said that the Lebanese Government will declare a war of independence against the Syrians if Damascus refuses to evacuate its soldiers from Lebanon.

Haddad told correspondents in Marj 'Uyun that right after the signing of the agreement between Israel and Lebanon, the Beirut Government will demand that the Syrians and the Palestinians evacuate their forces immediately. If the Syrians will refuse, Haddad is confident that Beirut will declare a war of independence and the United States will support it.

IDF Studying PLO's POW Exchange Conditions

TA170731 Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 0500 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] An army spokesman said the army is studying the conditions for a prisoner exchange presented by the PLO yesterday to the International Red Cross.

PLO spokesman 'Abd al-Muhsin Abu Mayzar said Israel must release all prisoners held at Ansar detention camp, 1,250 Palestinians held in Israeli jails, and return the contents of the Palestine Research Center in Beirut. Another demand is that the Palestinians released from Ansar and other places of imprisonment be allowed to stay on in areas under Israeli control in Lebanon, or in the territories and Israel itself.

In Jerusalem, a Foreign Ministry spokesman refused to comment on the terms.

Arens Says First Lavi Plane To Be Ready in 1986

TA160836 Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST in English 16 May 83 pp 1,2

[Text] Tel Aviv — The prototype of the Lavi warplane will be aloft in 1986, Defence Minister Moshe Arens yesterday told leading members of the Labour Party at the Dan Hotel Here.

Arens noted that $100 million had been invested in preliminary work, and confirmed that up to $2 billion might be spent in development work until the prototype is finished.

Arens stressed several times that "the quicker we get to work on the Lavi, the less it will cost to plan and build it," adding that when it is finished, "it will be the most advanced plane in the world." He pointed out that the U.S. is not presently developing any new combat plane, although Sweden and France are. Thus, the Lavi should be more technologically advanced than anything the Americans would have in 1986, and hopefully ahead of, or at least equal to, anything developed by France or Sweden.

Arens said Israeli authorities had faced a key question before going ahead with the Lavi: the level of Israeli technology, planning ability, and research and development. He said that in "some fields," Israel is ahead of the entire world, citing Israeli air performance in the Lebanon war. "We have the knowledge, and we have the skilled manpower. And if we lack certain trained personnel, we can hire engineers from abroad," said Arens. He believes Israel could develop the prototype "cheaper than the U.S., for Israel has in nearly all fields manpower possessing the same skills as the Americans."

What raises development costs in the U.S., he said, is the enormous amount of red tape involved there. Each Lavi may cost about $6 m., which means Israel must build about 200 of the planes. The overall cost of each plane produced in Israel is higher than that of a similar one produced in America, Arens noted, where planes are "manufactured in series of two thousand."

Israel has already received U.S. approval to buy an advanced model of the Pratt and Whitney engine used in the F-16.

Knesset Economic Committee Chairman Gad Ya'aqobi, who introduced Arens, said the Lavi is "not a matter for political discussion, but a bipartisan issue above politics. It should have enormous spin-off effects in other industries, as have other major technological developments in Israel sponsored by the Defence Forces."

Soviet Visitor on Nuclear Weapons, Jordan
TA151334 Tel Aviv YEDI'OT AHARONOT in Hebrew 15 May 83 p 3

[Report by Yo'av Qarni]

[Text] A senior Soviet commentator claims that Israel expressed readiness to station U.S. nuclear arms on its soil, and he says this suggestion was made at the time by Ari'el Sharon, when still defense minister, as the "strategic memorandum of understanding" was being prepared with the United States.

The commentator, Professor Igor Belyayev, is a member of the Soviet friendship delegation that arrived in Isarel 2 days ago as the guest of the Israel-Soviet friendship movement, founded by RAKAH. Belyayev is the foreign affairs editor for the Soviet periodical LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and specializes in Middle East affairs.

In the course of a meeting on Friday night with Tel Aviv friendship association members, Belyayev said the United States is examining ways to station nuclear arms in close proximity to the Soviet border if the plan to station modern medium-range missiles on Europe does not go through. He claims that the Americans are looking into ways of stationing such missiles in Turkey and in Israel. According to Belyayev, Minister Sharon offered to the United States stationing in Israel modern neutron arms — different from the conventional nuclear arms in that they destroy humans but leave property intact. "If such arms are really stationed in Israel, Israel will find itself in a difficult situation. You will become the hostage for the American nuclear arms in a confrontation with the Soviet Union."

On another matter, Belyayev disclosed that King Husayn had told him last summer that he anticipates an Israeli military operation against Jordan "within 2 years, in a bid to solve the Palestinian problem within the Jordanian framework." Belyayev's interview with Husayn was published at the time, although this passage was omitted, and it was first heard in public in Tel Aviv, of all places. "I value Husayn as a serious man, and so according to his prediction, 9 months still lie ahead before Israel attacks Jordan," he declared.

LIBYA

People's Foreign Liaison Committee Statement

LD141500 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] In response to the call made by the brother commander of the revolution on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of the eviction of the British imperialists from the homeland and on his incitation to the vocational congress to march on the People's Foreign Liaison Bureau; in consolidation of the people's authority; in affirmation of direct people's democracy, and from the concept that lasting relations exist between peoples and not governments, the people's foreign liaison committees of the vocational congresses marched on the People's Foreign Liaison Bureau this morning and set up a people's committee to run it and to turn it into an advance post of revolutionary action and a popular administration that will carry out the resolutions of the basic people's congress. The people's committees for foreign liaison at the vocational congresses, which undertook the march on the People's Foreign Liaison Bureau, have issued the following statement:

In reliance on God; from the concept of committees everywhere; in consolidation of the people's authority; in affirmation of direct democracy which provides that the people shall govern themselves by themselves through the people's congresses, which are vested with the absolute right to make decisions, and through the people's committees, which are the instruments of execution; in the implementation of the resolutions of the basic people's congresses providing the People's Foreign Liaison Bureau with all human and material resources that enable it to create relations on the level of the popular masses with all peoples of the world, so that the voice of the Libyan people will roar, resound and be heard carrying to all the peoples of the world the Libyan people's new human line of thinking — a line that is alive and calling for complete emancipation from all forms of oppression, repression and domination; in eptomization of the pioneering, revolutionary thesis that lasting human relations exist among peoples and not among governments, the Libyan Arab masses, through their vocational organizations, today march via the people's committees for foreign liaison at the vocational congresses that elected them to assume the task of implementing the resolutions governing relations between the Libyan people and the other world peoples, to form the people's committee of the Foreign Liaison Bureau.

This committee will assume its duties from today to effect the abovementioned change in popular political action. In this context, the committee will be guided by the Green ideology, the ideology of the third universal theory which unleashes latent potential and summons the peoples of the world to seek liberation, emancipation and revolution. This theory represents an immortal ideology which affirms noble human principles so that man's freedom is asserted, his full happiness is established, all forms of injustice and oppression are eliminated and a new world cultural rebirth is created enabling the peoples of the world to take command of their destinies and take hold of the reins of their affairs. It is a rebirth in which all traditional tools of governing such as governments, parliaments, assemblies,and parties disappear.

The basic task entrusted to this people's committee is to find the best means to create direct relations with all peoples, thereby overriding all obstacles and barriers that have become entrenched by the existing forms of government in the world. Its task also is to find the best means to ensure implementation of the resolutions that were formulated at the general People's Congress general conference which govern the Libyan Arab people's foreign policy, with all the great responsibilities that the implementation of such new mass action unparalleled in traditional diplomacy entails. The shouldering of these huge responsibilities demands continual sacrifices and an aggressive revolutionary spirit, which will move on from the task of following reactions and coexisting with them to the more advanced task of creating action. The best guide in this regard can be seen in the huge and serious changes that have taken place in Libya, brought about by the society of the masses so that actions in the field of our foreign relations would become a true picture and a genuine reflection of all these changes.

The new, popular relations, which are formulated by the Green ideology of the masses and put forward by the society of the masses, represent a new experiment of which every human being on earth should have access so that those people aspiring to freedom can drink from its spring and thus succeed in staging an overwhelming revolution that would destroy all the props of oppression, repression and tyranny and do away with all unjust norms dominating people's destinies. This new way of presenting relations among peoples is bound to bypass all the old, exhausted forms, which prevent the creation of direct relations among peoples. This is because these exhausted forms have always been among the direct causes of tension in relations among nations and peoples and in the creation of wars and sedition.

Relations binding the world's peoples and nations have been directed by individuals on the strength of the theory of representation, which kings have adopted since ancient times. This theory provides for the representation by an ambassador of one king at the court of another, or at best to represent a government before the other government. This situation makes relations between the two peoples dependent on the evaluation and whims of these representatives, and thus almost rules out any relations between the two peoples, if not making such relations nonexistent. Furthermore, any head of government or state can, over a minor issue, recall his ambassador and sever these so-called relations.

So that such forms will no longer exist and so that solid direct relations may exist among the peoples, the Libyan people, having declared the people's authority, assumed full control over their entire destinies, proven the feasibility of the establishment of the people's authority with such unexcelled success, who created the first Jamahiriyah in history by adopting the pioneering Green ideology, which was formulated by the brother commander, teacher and revolutionary thinker, Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi — the ideology of freedom, happiness for peoples and the assertion of man's identity — set forth today a new model and a unique experience in relations among peoples.

The success scored by the experiment of the Libyan mass society in asserting the authority of the people, an experiment which provides the final and radical solution to the problem of government, makes it imperative for all Libyans to be messengers of this experiment and its creative pioneering ideology. It is also our duty and a task laid on our shoulders to carry this ideology to all the world's peoples as a contribution from us toward the reformulation of life and the building of human civilization based on justice and equality, thus affirming to the world's peoples that we are in the vanguard of nations that are keen on safeguarding man's peace and progress, and that we are the emissaries of modern civilization. This new, modern civilization requires that relations among peoples be direct and cooperation between them equal for the good of mankind, and not governed by the views of ambassadors or the whims of rulers.

In order to affirm all these principles, and so that all the tools that carry out the implementation of the resolutions of the great Libyan Arab people shall become popular tools, including those entrusted with the implementation of the people's foreign policy, the vocational congresses have selected popular committees for their foreign liaison bureaus. The popular committees of the foreign liaison bureaus of all the vocational congresses have now marched on the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison to form its people's committee.

As of this moment, this committee takes full control of this utility and assumes its full administration, so as to turn it into an advanced trench for creative revolutionary work, and into a popular administration under the full supervision and control of the popular congresses so that direct relations can be created with the world's peoples that are stronger, clearer and who, with nobler objectives and essence, are pledging to their commander and people that the Green Book will be their guide, spring and ideology.

Forward. The Al-Fatih forever. The revolutionary struggle will continue until the people's authority spreads and becomes established.

The popular committees of the foreign liaison bureaus of the vocational congresses which carried out the march, addressed the following cable to the commander of the revolution:

To the revolutionary thinker, Col Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, commander of the Great 1 September Revolution. Greetings of the free men and revolutionaries.

We, members of the popular committees of the foreign liaison bureaus of the vocational congresses, as we march on the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison, take control of its administration, and form its people's committee, we affirm to you our everlasting and absolute commitment to the authority of the people. We have formed ourselves as a combat squad for revolutionary action and as an advanced vanguard for popular mass action, guided by the Green ideology, the ideology of you, commander of the revolution and the champion of the march. We declare to you that we will neither wane nor rest until your creative ideology spreads throughout the world and until every man becomes free.

We also pledge to you, our commander, and to our people, that we will always be prepared to carry out the decision of death. We declare to all that we will accept no other leader but you, and no ideology other than the Green Book to be our beacon, guide and ideology. May you live long.

Al-Fatih forever. The revolutionary struggle will continue.

[Signed] The People's Foreign Liaison Committee

Paper Discloses CIA Activity in U.S. Embassies

PM161459 Tripoli AL-ZAHAF Al-AKHDAR in English 7 May 83 pp 1,4

[Unattributed article: "U.S. Embassies: Centers of Espionage"]

[Text] The recent revelation that seven CIA officers were killed in the U.S. Embassy bomb blast in Beirut in April has provided further confirmation of the role U.S. diplomatic missions play in supporting the CIA's espionage activities and subversion overseas.

The United States has espionage centres wherever there is a U.S. Embassy because CIA officers are routinely attached to diplomatic missions and have diplomatic cover, allowing them to indulge in intrigue and various criminal activities, including the physical liquidation of leaders of revolutionary and national liberation movements in many parts of the world.

The U.S. embassies are in fact no more than a front, behind which is hidden the activities of an organisation with blood-stained hands, namely the CIA. That agency's record is well known. Apart from murdering revolutionary leaders in various parts of the world, it has instigated and taken part in acts of collective liquidation of people deemed to be America's enemies, while it has also done everything possible to protect its agents, political or otherwise, who act against their own people's interests.

The CIA need we be reminded was behind the murder of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo in 1960 and it was also behind the coups which overthrew Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana and Mossadeq in Iran. The CIA has attempted to assassinate Fidel Castro on several occasions and has also concocted the most fantastic plans aimed at the destruction of the Cuban revolution.

Chemical Weapons

The CIA was furthermore responsible for drawing up the requirements which led to the invention of the most dangerous and lethal chemical weapons which have been used in Vietnam and Nicaragua in the past and which are today being used in El Salvador.

In addition to the aforementioned covert criminal activities the Central Intelligence Agency trains mercenaries and fugitive criminals who are then unleashed on the peaceful peoples of the world who would resist American domination. The proof of this has been provided by what is going on today in Nicaragua, where CIA-trained supporters of the former Nicaragua dictator

Anastasio Somoza are attacking peaceful civilians and bringing terror to that land's countryside.

Similarly the CIA is providing support for the agent regime in Honduras, where the training and the equipping of the terrorists who are sent into Nicaragua takes place. Equally the CIA bears full responsibility for the daily massacres which take place in El Salvador, because the CIA has ranged itself against the very forces of revolution which wish to put an end to those massacres and liberate the Salvadoran people.

It is indeed ironic that such crimes are being planned, financed and committed by a power which hosts the United Nations and which furthermore lays claim to being a champion of human rights. The use of American embassies as espionage centres, where the CIA plans its covert operations in the host country, was proved by the number of CIA operatives known to have been killed in the Beirut explosion. In the light of the size of the CIA presence which is now known to have existed in Beirut, other countries may want to review the position of American diplomatic personnel and take great care in screening them and investigating their alleged activities and tasks.

This is made doubly important by the fact that it is clear that most diplomatic personnel if not all of them, are in some way employed by the CIA, as was revealed by Iranian revolutionaries investigation of papers found at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. This investigation proved that Iran's Islamic revolution had a legitimate reason to charge U.S. Embassy personnel with espionage.

In the light of what is known about U.S. espionage activities and the role which U.S. embassies play in supporting CIA operations around the world, it is obvious that something must be done to put an end to these activities, which threaten the security of nations hosting U.S. diplomatic missions.

The United States must be made to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of other peoples, on the basis of equality between nations and of non-interference in their internal affairs. This is a principle of relations between states which is transgressed by the kind of activities which seem to be the main preoccupation of so many U.S. diplomats around the world.

The Beirut explosion provided further proof of the way in which the long arm of the CIA extends to every corner of the globe. Who knows what the CIA agents who died in the embassy bomb blast were planning to do, but what is certain is that they were not doing nothing. This revelation of the extent of the CIA present in Beirut shows that countries need to be on their guard against that agency's activities and should also inquire a little more closely into the activities of socalled U.S. diplomats.

MOROCCO

Lebanese Envoy Arrives With Al-Jumayyil Message

LD161336 Rabat MAP in English 1304 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Fes, May 16 (MAP) — Dr. Baha' ad-Din al-Bisat, Lebanese minister of [state for] hydraulic resources and electricity, arrived here Sunday evening, with a message from Lebanese President Amin al-Jumayyil to King Hassan II of Morocco.

The Lebanese emissary leads a delegation comprising Ambassador Ibrahim Khorma [as received] and a top military official Mr. Abbas Hamdane, both members of the commission to the Lebanese-American-Israeli negotiations on the withdrawal of foreign forces from Lebanon.

The message reportedly deals with the draft text of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement on the pull out of foreign forces from that country.

Other emissaries were dispatched to Gulf countries on a similar mission.

Meets With King Hassan

LD162127 Rabat Domestic Service in Arabic 2000 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Baha' ad-Din al-Bisat, Lebanese minister of state for water and electricity, minister of housing and cooperatives, and envoy of Lebanese President Amin al-Jumayyil to his majesty the king, left Morocco this evening after being received by his majesty the king at the presidential palace in Fes. The meeting took approximately 35 minutes and was attended by M'hammed Boucetta, minister of state in charge of foreign affairs, who returned from a tour of a number of African states. It was attended also by Abdelhaq Tazi, secretary of state for foreign affairs, and his majesty's adviser, Ahmed Bensouda.

Following his meeting with his majesty the king the Lebanese envoy said in a radio statement that Lebanese President Amin al-Jumayyil asked him to convey a sincere greeting on his own behalf and on behalf of the Lebanese Government and people to his majesty the king for his constant and true feeling and great concern for Lebanon's destiny.

He said that he informed his majesty of the critical events which Lebanon has recently experienced, that he found his majesty fully informed of all the conditions which Lebanon has experienced, that he understands all that Lebanon has been doing within its complete national sovereignty, and that he desires every move to be made within the framework of safeguarding Lebanese national unity and the interests of the whole Arab world.

The Lebanese envoy said that Morocco, which has always offered its help in critical situations, is ready to redouble its efforts today to help Lebanon overcome the critical stage which it is experiencing from its desire to safeguard its independence and its Arab position, which are cherished by the president of the republic, the prime minister and the Lebanese people.

The Lebanese minister added: Lebanon is part of the Arab world and is resolved most certainly to play its part as a member of the Arab world, to be as always a giver and to give the Arab issues every assistance. It also cherishes its own interests and its existence as part of the Arab world, and it should remain in full control of its complete sovereignty.

Opposition Party To Boycott 10 June Election
LD161303 Rabat MAP in Arabic 0900 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Casablanca, 16 May (MAP) — The Moroccan opposition party, the National Union of Popular Forces, announced in a statement distributed to the press on Saturday that it will not take part in the coming 10 June general elections. It believes the government decided "suddenly" to hold elections.

The statement says the Central Council of the party met on Sunday in a regular meeting to hear a political report by Secretary General Abdallah Ibrahim, on the coming general elections. The statement says that the council "is convinced of the need to rally all progressive national forces within a unified strategy with the aim of working together to establish a sound democratic regime capable of giving the country a solid base and an authentic national stability, and of enabling the masses in Morocco to build a society dominated by justice, freedom and equality." The statement also says that in view of these considerations and in line with the expressed directives, which are being defended by the overwhelming majority of the representatives of the base in the National Union of Popular Forces, both inside and outside its organizational bodies, the Central Council decided at its 8 May 1983 session "not to participate in the general elections which the government decided suddenly to hold on 10 June."

It is worth recalling that the National Union of Popular Forces boycotted the 1976 general elections.

SUDAN

Compulsory Military Service Bill Approved
JN162022 Khartoum SUNA in Arabic 1445 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Khartoum, 16 May (SUNA) — The People's Assembly met this morning under Assembly Speaker 'Izz ad-Din as-Sayyid during which it approved the compulsory national military service bill for the year 1983 during its second reading.

Dr Fatima 'Abd al-Mahmud, assistant rapporteur of the People's Assembly, explained the circumstances which dictated the establishment of compulsory national military service and the general objectives of such a move represented in the preparation of trained cadres to form the bases of the reserve forces.

TUNISIA

Lebanese Envoy Arrives in Tunis 16 May
NC162055 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 2000 GMT 16 May 83

[Excerpts] Minister Baha' ad-Din al-Bisat arrived in Tunis this evening following a visit to Morocco and Algeria. In Morocco, Al-Bisat presented President Al-Jumayyil's message to King Hassan II and explained the Lebanese-Israeli agreement to him.

King Hassan II said: We support President Al-Jumayyil in all his positions and back Lebanon in every action. We admire the sound moves Lebanon is making, because the question is not one of land as much as concern about the land's sovereignty, independence, and Arab interests in the Arab world. This is what President Al-Jumayyil is doing.

Minister Al-Bisat said King Hassan II told him that Lebanon must survive, enjoy fu'. sovereignty, and act to consolidate national unity.

Bourguiba Receives Libya's Al-'Ubaydi 16 May
LD161627 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba received this morning Brother 'Abd al-'Ati al-'Ubaydi, secretary of the Popular Committee for the People's Foreign Liaison Bureau, who handed him a written message from the brother leader of the revolution. The meeting was attended by Prime Minister Mohamed Mzali, Foreign Minister Es-Sebsi, and the Jamahiriyah general commissioner to Tunisia.

Brother Al-'Ubaydi said after his meeting with the Tunisian president that the latter conveyed to him his greetings to and appreciation for the brother leader of the revolution and the Libyan Arab people and his full satisfaction withthe substantial development witnessed by the relations of cooperation between the Jamahiriyah and Tunisia. He said that President Bourguiba also confirmed to him his and Tunisia's eagerness to complete the steps toward the economic, cultural, and social integration signed during the visit of the brother leader of the revolution to Tunisia in February last year. He added that it was agreed that the supreme joint committee will meet in July to approve the protocols of cooperation endorsed by the specialist committees in their previous meetings.

WESTERN SAHARA

Minister Accuses Morocco, U.S. of 'Sabotage'
AB131026 Paris AFP in English 1011 GMT 13 May 83

[Excerpt] Nairobi, May 13 (AFP) — Ibrahim Hakim, foreign minister of the Saharan Republic proclaimed by the Polisario in the Western Sahara, today accused Morocco, the United States and other countries of trying to sabotage next month's third attempt to hold the 19th summit of the Organization of Africa Unity.

Morocco, which is fighting Polisario Front guerrillas for control of what was formerly the Spanish Sahara, heads a large minority of OAU members who objected to the admission of the Saharan Republic (SDAR) as the 51st member of the OAU.

Differences over the SDAR and the issue of Chad's representation were mainly responsible for a boycott which resulted in the postponement of two attempts last year to hold the OAU summit in Tripoli, Libya.

Mr Hakim said that "Morrocco and the countries which support it have realized that a quorum (for the third summit attempt) is inevitable, which is why they are seeking to postpone it."

He said that the question of SDAR participation at the summit could not be raised at the meeting, which has been organized at OAU Headquarters in Addis Ababa at the beginning of next month. An OAU committee of 12 member states had decided that it should take place without prior conditions, he noted.

Mr Hakim said the Polisario would publish "written proof" that the United States was behind moves to get the Addis Ababa summit postponed.

His remarks were part of a growing number of statements and trips being made by African leaders across the continent.

ETHIOPIA

Eritrean, Other Regional Appointments Reported

EA170110 Addis Ababa Domestic Service in Amharic 1700 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] A spokesman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council [PMAC] disclosed this evening that the PMAC has made the following 10 appointments: Comrade Brigadier General Negussie Wolde Michael, COPWE Central Committee member, to be chief administrator of Hararge region; Comrade Brigadier General Worku Zewde to be commander in chief of the police force of Eritrea Region; Comrade Mered Negussie to be chief administrator of Eritrea Region; Comrade Wogayehu Sahlu, to be chief administrator of Gondar Region; Comrade Godana Chuni to be chief administrator of Bale Region; Comrade Tefera Endalew to be chief administrator of Sidamo Region; Comrade Mehari Measho to be deputy administrator of Wollo Region; Comrade (Mebarjan Ali) to be deputy administrator of Ilubabor Region; Comrade Desta Meshesha to be deputy administrator of Tegre Region; and Comrade Alemayehu Tabor to be deputy administrator of Bale Region.

KENYA

Government To Hold Early Election in September

AB170921 Paris AFP in English 0907 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] Nairobi, May 17 (AFP) — Kenya will hold an early general election next September, it was decided today at a meeting here of the Executive Committee of the Kenya African National Union (KANU) Party.

Sources close to the meeting said Kenyan head of state Daniel arap Moi declined to identify the "traitor" he recently said was being groomed by a foreign power to overthrow him.

Kenya's last general election was held in November 1979, with the next election scheduled for the end of 1984.

All candidates must have the authorization of Kenya's sole political party, the KANU, to run.

Minister Affirms Loyalty to Arap Moi

EA161035 Nairobi Domestic Service in English 1000 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] The minister for constitutional affairs, Mr Charles Njonjo, has said he is not the person being groomed for the post of president in this country by a foreign power. Mr Njonjo declared that he is and has always been loyal to President Daniel arap Moi. He told a press conference in his office this morning that his stand on the sanctity of Kenya's Constitution and constitutional process is well known. The minister said he would oppose any attempt by any foreign power to interfere in the internal affairs of the country.

He categorically denied being groomed for any office in the country contrary to what he claimed was being suggested by certain politicians and the press. Mr Njonjo expressed full confidence in the authorities in the country to unearth the person reportedly being groomed for the presidency and he said politicians and the press have an important duty of rallying behind the president in his difficult task of leading the nation. The minister said he did not want to engage himself in what he called witchhunting allegedly being waged by some politicians in the press. He refused to answer any questions from the press.

CHAD

Further Reportage on Factional Fighting

Authorities Deny Faya-Largeau Surrounded

AB161549 Paris AFP in French 1357 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Ndjamena, 16 May (AFP) — The Chadian authorities today categorically denied that Faya-Largeau (a town in the Borkou-Ennedi-Tibesti prefecture in northern Chad) has been surrounded by the forces of the Transitional National Union Government [GUNT], headed by former President Goukouni Oueddei.

In a statement to AFP, Chadian Information Minister Mahamat Soumaila asserted that the government forces were in a "good position" as far as the enemy forces were concerned. He also stressed that the clashes in the north of Chad are not "new." On the other hand, he said that "Libya and its mercenaries" are the ones fighting Chad and not elements of the GUNT, which the minister described as "nonexistent."

The Chadian minister affirmed that "the encircling" of Farya-Largeau or any other Chadian town by elements opposed to the Chadian Government is part of the false allegations by JANA, the Libyan news agency, which announced today that Faya-Largeau has been surrounded by the forces of the GUNT.

It will be recalled that Adem Ya'qub, Goukouni Oueddei's adviser, asserted yesterday evening in Paris that GUNT troops were around Faya-Largeau.

The AFP correspondent in the area has observed that, during the past few days, planes belonging to the Chadian Air Force have made flights between Ndjamena and Faya.

Rebels Claim Minister Killed

OW170237 Hong Kong AFP in English 0156 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] Brussels, May 17 (AFP) — A spokesman for antigovernment rebels in Chad claimed here Monday they had captured the northern Chad capital of Faya-Largeau and that the interior minister and another top official may have been killed in the fighting. (The government of President Hissein Habre denied Monday that the Libyan-backed rebel forces of ousted President Goukouni Oueddei had surrounded the town and said government troops were facing Libyan, not Chadian soldiers). The rebel spokesman, Issaka Ramatalhamdou, Mr Goukouni's representative in Europe, told AFP the town had fallen after a weekend of fighting during which some 600 government troops and 138 rebels had been killed. Among those reported missing, he said, were Interior Minister Tahar Guinassou and another top government official, Gabe Bang. Both were in the area to direct the fighting, he said. Mr Issaka strongly denied government charges that members of Libya's Islamic Legion were involved in the battles. The rebels had taken a total of 783 prisoners, he said. A Goukouni spokesman said in Paris Sunday that the latest fighting had developed from the failure of a government attempt to recapture the nearby town of Ounianga-Kebir at the end of last week. Faya-Largeau, with a population of 7,000, is about 800 kms (500 miles) northeast of Ndjamena, the Chadian capital.

Bardai Charges FAN Causes Border Incidents

AB140613 (Clandestine) Bardai Chadian National Radio in French 1800 GMT 13 May 83

[Station commentary]

[Text] For some time now, a certain topic has been much discussed. But we have chosen to keep quiet about it on good grounds. The subject is — you must have guessed — the hotbed of tension created in the zone of Lake Chad, more precisely, on the Chad-Nigeria border. If we now decide to discuss it on our program, it is because we have attentively followed this strange affair and have realized that the mystification and the great publicity surrounding this matter could mislead national and international opinion.

For a better understanding of what is going on at Lake Chad, it is necessary to be thoroughly acquainted with the bellicose nature of the national annihilation forces [FAN] and their shady leader, as well as the precise context of the events.

As everyone knows, Hissein Habre's subversive policy is inspired essentially by the reactionary doctrines of his historic idols, such as Hitler and Mussolini, and by the subversive instructions of his imperialist French and U.S. masters. The false nationalism of the German Nazi leader is known all too well throughout the world. Therefore, no one should still be taken in by the ignoble action of his emulator in Africa.

Let us examine the facts. There is no doubt that the FAN, which has a destabilizing mission, has always sought to prove to national and international opinion that it was defending Chadian interests by making certain claims. In this connection, in order to divert world attention from the crushing defeats suffered by its puppet army in the north, in the south, and in the center of the country against the National Liberation Army [ANL], the reactionary and moribund clique recently alleged that the country has been invaded by an Islamic Legion composed essentially of Beninese, Congolese, and Central African nationals. It also spoke of a foreign occupation of part of Chad. From allegation to allegation, from news release to news release, the renegades who were introduced by the imperialists into Ndjamena have even filed a so-called complaint to the UN Security Council, a move which they were not legally entitled to make. Everyone knows what became of that sordid and irresponsible act, which was aimed at allowing U.S. imperialism to become militarily and overtly involved on the side of the so-called leader of Ndjamena following his failure to achieve international recognition.

Then there was a dramatic development. By intentionally creating the Lake Chad events, Hissein Habre wanted to make believe once again that he is a super nationalist and a defender of Chadian territory, which is not at all true. One must not allow oneself to be misled regarding Habre's true intentions. After deliberately creating the reported incident, the puppet group of traitors in Ndjamena again tried to sow confusion among the

people by alleging on Radio Ndjamena that two Libyan aircraft stocked with arms landed at Maiduguri on 2 April 1983. Employing the Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah as a favorite scapegoat is a clear and even classic form of behavior for a protege of Ronald Reagan. In fact, Hissein Habre sees Libya's shadow everywhere, just as other African reactionary leaders do in their attempt to account for the failure of their social policy. Hissein Habre wants to play the innocent one and makes libelous — to say the least — accusations against a Nigerian Army general, Mahamat Feteh, a well-known son of independent Africa; Ali Mahamat, a businessman; and the honorable imam, Ibrahim Saleh, all of them Nigerians who are widely respected for their common sense and humanitarian spirit. In accusing them, the head of the Ndjamena gang, who has no more arguments, tried to create dissent among Nigerian leaders.

It is no secret to anyone that Hissein Habre is spending huge sums of money on a network of terrorists and professional agitators whose mission is to eliminate the sympathizers of the Transitional National Union Government [GUNT] who have sought refuge in that brotherly country, to create difficult conditions for them, or simply to secure their extradition to Ndjamena.

Moreover, Hissein Habre's reactionary clique is concerned about the great prestige and hospitality which the GUNT sympathizers enjoy in Nigeria. This is why the FAN's blood-thirsty men attempt to harm these sympathizers by discrediting Nigerian politicians who have adopted a favorable attitude toward the GUNT, which was formed in the wake of the Lagos accords.

In addition, the blood-thirsty terrorist group in Ndjamena does not like the recent rapproachment between Nigeria, the giant of Africa, and the great Libyan Jamahiriyah, and their role in the promotion of peace in Chad worries the puppet with close ties to international imperialism. This is so worrying to him that at the request of their other African masters, his group of traitors is leaving no stone unturned to sabotage any African settlement of the Chadian conflict.

Lastly, that man of straw and traitor to the African cause is trying in vain to drown the fish [as heard] in resorting to demagogy and diversion. So, contrary to their gross campaign of lies, Hissein Habre and his clique of traitors are not concerned with the interests of the Chadian nation. By initiating an illegal diplomatic action at the Security Council, and by deliberately causing incidents at the Nigeria-Chad border, the traitors, whoare now cornered, are trying to get out of the serious political, military, and social situation which they are facing. However, whatever strategem the national annihilation forces use, they remain an evil force for our people and for Africa as a whole. The ANL and the GUNT regard it as their historic duty to render them harmless.

GABON

Bongo Returns From Guinea, Makes Statement

AB161126 Libreville Africa No 1 in French 0630 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Edem Kodjo arrived in Libreville yesterday a few hours before the return of Gabonese President Bongo from Conakry, Guinea, where he paid a 48-hour visit. In the Guinean capital, the founding secretary general of the Gabonese Democratic Party [PDG] and head of state led an important government and PDG delegation to the 36th anniversary of the Democratic Party of Guinea.

On his return, President Bongo declared that Guinea is in perfect health and that the people are mobilized behind their leader, President Sekou Toure. In addition, President Bongo spoke about the situation of Guineans resident in Gabon. Listen to the Gabonese president:

[Begin Bongo recording] If they were opponents of President Sekou Toure, I would have them put on an aircraft. Gabon is not a welcoming ground for opponents. I suppose there are Guineans who work here. If I should ever observe that these Guineans are pursuing a policy contrary to that which we have defined, namely, noninterference in the affairs of other countries, whatever the case may be, I will have put them on board an aircraft.

If today any Guinean at all — even some who I know here — wants to go and pay a visit to his family in Conakry, he has only to come to me and I will put him on an aircraft and he will go and come back to resume his work in Gabon. [end recording]

GHANA

Enin Meets With DPRK Delegation 16 May

AB161415 Accra Domestic Service in English 1300 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] The three-member delegation from the DPRK, currently in the country for a 5-day visit, this morning held discussions with Mrs Anna Enin, a member of the Provisional National Defense Council at the Castle in Accra. The discussions, which were held behind closed doors, among other things, touched on bilateral relations and cooperation between Ghana and Korea.

The delegation was led by the DPRK deputy minister for foreign affairs, Kim Chae-Pong. Also at the meeting was the DPRK ambassador in Ghana, Choe U-chin.

MALI

Algiers Paper Interviews President Moussa Traore

PM160758 Algiers EL MOUDJAHID in French 9 May 83 p 16

[Interview with Malian President Moussa Traore by APS in Algiers — date not given]

[Text][Question] You have signed the agreement on state borders with President Chadli Bendjedid. What do you think is the significance of this action, Mr President?

[Answer] First, through this agreement we experienced a very intense moment in our two countries' lives. As I have had occasion to say repeatedly there is more than just friendship, fraternity, and solidarity between Algeria and Mali. There is more than just fruitful and friendly cooperation between Algeria and Mali. In addition we have just sealed this friendship and fraternity between our countries and our peoples. In other words we have closed a very important chapter in our two countries' history and we have expressed a political will by drawing the border between our two countries in a simple and definitive way. This proves once again that African leaders are capable of solving their own problems without resorting to any intermediary at all. That is the profound significance of the signing of this agreement.

[Question] Mr President, when you arrived you stressed the exemplary nature of Algerian-Malian cooperation. What prospects do you think there are for further strengthening this cooperation?

[Answer] You know that there is already cooperation among the developing countries. And it is a cooperation which I will call border cooperation because the populations have anticipated the governments. The governments are now following the people by modernizing trade among their countries. For instance, there has been fruitful trade between Algeria and Mali for thousands of years. By modernizing our trade we are going to follow, if not overtake, our people by strengthening and developing this cooperation in all spheres so that it is an example to all Third World countries. In saying all spheres I am thinking primarily of the training of supervisory personnel, second of the exchange of Malian and Algerian experiences, and finally of trade between Algeria and Mali. As you see, the spheres of cooperation between our two countries are vast and we want to cover them all by our respective experiences.

[Question] Mr President, you have discussed the OAU crisis. How do you envisage the outcome of the OAU summit in a few weeks' time?

[Answer] I would like to repeat here that the OAU is suffering a crisis. I have said and I repeat that it is necessary to overcome this crisis alone. All the member states must have the political will to do so. The "Group of 12" which was formed at the second Tripoli meeting expressed a point which strikes me as very important and which also expresses African wisdom. The summit must first be held at the headquarters in Addis Ababa and it must be held without conditions. The problems worrying the various countries will be discussed in the presence of all the member countries and appropriate solutions will be envisaged so that this crisis, which is in fact not a crisis because it hinges on two fundamental questions — first that of the SDAR and second that of Chad — can be overcome. The SDAR question was discussed at one summit. Solutions were more or less envisaged but were never implemented. It is up to us to review the situation and listen to the SDAR leaders, because their country is now a member of our continental organization. Thus I think that with a little courage we will really be able to find an adequate solution to the SDAR question. As for the Chadian question, when it arose we said that it was not the first time that a Chadian problem tried to paralyze the OAU. The most appropriate solution was applied to this problem at all times and at Council of Ministers level. I do not think and I am not convinced that this Chadian problem alone could spark a crisis within the OAU. There are certainly unavowed interests looming behind this question. These interests must precisely be destroyed to pave the way for our organization's success. That is how we can envisage overcoming our organization's crisis, which can in fact be overcome with a minimum of political will.

[Question] Mr President, what is your analysis of the latest developments in the Maghreb for achieving positive, good-neighborly relations?

[Answer] I have always believed in frank, sincere, and fruitful dialogue. I think that once dialogue has been established among the Maghreb countries a whole series of solutions to a number of problems facing the Maghreb may emerge from that dialogue. So, in the interest of their respective peoples and countries, that will certainly strengthen the continental organization. That is my very brief analysis of the developments in the Maghreb situation.

[Question] Mr President, there have been reports of a plan to unite Mali and Guinea. Could you tell us what progress that plan has made?

[Answer] President Sekou Toure visited Bamako and I went to Conakry. There are no taboos. Indeed, during President Sekou Toure's visit last year he proposed a union between Mali and Guinea. Mali, which has laid down in its Constitution that its people are prepared to abandon part or all of their sovereignty to

strengthen and develop African unity, cannot refuse to accept union with an African country. But the objective conditions for this union must be found. And it was the objectives of union and the ways and means of attaining them that we examined so that the union between Mali and Guinea could be achieved. I think that my speech in reply to President Sekou Toure after the signing of the cooperation agreement aimed at strengthening the many different ties uniting our two countries broadly defined the ways and means of achieving union between our two countries.

[Question] The economic situation of many African states is causing concern, and that implies broader action. What lines do you think this action would take, Mr President?

[Answer] During my talks with the Algerian leaders I have just stated that the world crisis is affecting all countries, be they rich or poor, developed or developing, and that we African countries will only be able to overcome this economic crisis to the extent that there is first dialogue among officials, loyal and frank cooperation among our populations and the full implementation of the Lagos plan, which means that the continent will be divided into regions for total integration which will finally encompass the whole of Africa. If these conditions are not met, if these measures are not applied, the poorest countries will continue to be poor, the richest of the poor countries will continue to be underprivileged and there will be no alternative solutions unless we implement the measures deicded in Lagos. This is how we see the problem of development in Africa. We cannot envisage any other solutions outside this course. Experience in Africa has shown that autarchy does not pay in Africa.

NIGER

Classes Resume at Niamey University 16 May

AB161329 Paris AFP in English 1312 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Niamey, May 16 (AFP) — Classes resumed today to a limited extent at Niamey University and the Niger capital's two high schools after a government warning that a two-week strike by students must end, reliable sources said.

The university said that between 45 and 55 percent of students were back in class, according to their faculty, subject and year of study. Attendance was highest among students in their final year.

In the two high schools, the 880-pupil Issa Korombe and the 700-pupil Kassai, authorities said around half the students were back at their desks.

Prime Minister Mamane Ourou met other ministers today to assess the situation and decided on what further measures to take, a source close to the premier said.

On Friday, Illa Maikassaoua and Captain Mahamane Ousseini, respectively the ministers of higher education and research and national education, warned students to end the strike completely and without conditions by Monday.

In speeches broadcast on every news bulletin over the weekend, the two ministers warned that if resumption of classes were not "total and effective," the university and schools would be closed and the students sent back to their families.

Those in their final year would be banned from further study and made to undertake an unspecified activity, the ministers said.

Students were also told that any further street demonstrations would be severely repressed. Mr. Maikassaoua added that if classes were not resumed today, all students living on the campus would have to move out or be evicted by force.

A reliable source said that as a result, student lodgings had been almost completely emptied over the weekend as their residents looked for rooms in the city.

The university students went on strike on May 2 in support of colleagues in the College of Agronomy who were fighting the staff and education authorities over a continuous assessment scheme.

The school pupils joined the strike on May 5 following the death of a student after he had been arrested by police.

NIGERIA

Government Denies Loan Agreement With IMF

AB170925 Lagos NAN in English 0840 GMT 17 May 83

[Text] Lagos, May 16 (NAN) — The Federal Ministry of Finance today denied a front page report in a national newspaper that arrangements had been concluded by the federal government to receive a 2 billion naira loan from the IMF.

The statement said that the publication was misleading, adding that the Federal Government has certainly not finalised arrangements for any loan from the IMF. (NAN)

SENEGAL

Boucetta Hands Note to President, Goes to Guinea

LD141354 Rabat MAP in English 1206 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Dakar, May 14 — (MAP) — Mr. M'hamed Boucetta, Moroccan minister of state for foreign affairs left here, Friday afternoon, for Conakry to convey to Guinean President Haj Ahmed Sekou Toure a message from King Hassan II of Morocco.

Mr Boucetta was received on Friday morning in Dakar by Sengalese President Abdou Diouf to whom he handed a message from the Moroccan monarch.

Shortly before leaving the Senegalese capital, the Moroccan state minister received the high commissioner of Cambia in Senegal, Mr Sidi Ahmed Tijani. During this meeting, attended by Sengalese Foreign Minister Mr Mustapha Niasse, the two officials reviewed issues of common interest as well as bilateral relations.

Upon arrival in Dakar, Mr Boucetta reaffirmed that the royal message dealt with issues of common interest and was part of permanent consultations between the two heads of state.

SIERRA LEONE

Stevens Denies Constitution To Be Changed

AB161502 Paris AFP in English 1336 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Freetown, May 16 (AFP) — President Siaka Stevens has denied that Sierra Leone is about to amend its Constitution in favor of a ceremonial presidency and executive prime minister.

Mr Stevens told a constitution convention at the weekend in Bo, Southern Province, that "reports of an alleged amendment to the Constitution are acts of irresponsibility without foundation."

The weekly WATCH newspaper reported on May 7 that preparations were under way to amend the 1978 constitution which paved the way for a one-party system.

The paper said that reliable sources had "hinted" that the constitutional amendment would also abolish the two vice presidencies, with Sierra Leone reverting to its pre-1971 constitutional situation.

The paper said that observers considered that a constitutional amendment would be "a means of silencing old political comrades, allowing new wine into old bottles," and added that "supporters of those likely to be affected are holding frantic meetings in camera to neutralise this move."

TOGO

West Germany's Warnke Visits Koutouboug, Kara

AB151844 Lome Domestic Service in French 1230 GMT 15 May 83

[Excerpt] After taking care of accomodations for his guest, Strauss, President Eyadema went to Lome II where he received in audience Juergen Warnke, the FRG minister for economic cooperation, who has been visiting our country since yesterday.

Talks between the two men were followed by a luncheon in which many Central Committee members participated.

The FRG-Togolese friendship, which has just been heightened with the visit of Minister President Franz Josef Strauss, was further invigorated yesterday with the arrival of Juergen Warnke.

The economic cooperation minister, was welcomed on arrival at the Niamtougou International Airport by Pali Challa, minister of commerce and transport, and Ayite Mawuko Ajavon, minister of justice and keeper of the seal, both members of the Central Committee. He was earlier presented with a bouquet of flowers by a girl.

Mr Warnke was accompanied during his regional tour by Anani Akakpo-Ahianyo, a Central Committee member and minister of foreign affairs and cooperation; Anani Gassou, minister of rural development; and Koffi Walla, minister of planning and administrative reform. The FRG ambassador to Togo and the Togolese ambassador to the FRG participated in the trip.

After the welcoming ceremony at Niamtougou, the delegation was given another popular welcome at the Kara party house, where many activists and folk groups waited for them.

The FRG delegation also witnessed a colorful parade of Kara activists groups. The delegation then had lunch and during the toast, the prefect of Akoza stressed that this visit was symbolic of the friendship between Togo and the FRG, which was desired by our two heads of state. The prefect of Akoza, Louis Lamba, on behalf of the people of this prefecture, wished the minister a nice visit to Kara.

In return, the FRG minister said he was very happy with the welcome given by the people of Akoza, which proves that Togolese and Germans are linked by years of common history. The FRG minister said all he has seen in Togo accords exactly with the image Germans have of our country.

After the parade, the FRG delegation visited the town of Kara. It visited the brewery and the handicapped handicrafts center of Niamtougou to get an idea of the level of development of this region. The delegation visited Sarakawa to acquaint itself with what the Sarakawa symbol means to the Togolese people.

ANGOLA

Dos Santos Receives Special Envoy From Sao Tome

MB140830 Luanda Domestic Service in Portuguese 0500 GMT 14 May 83

[Excerpt] At the Futungo de Belas in Luanda yesterday, Comrade Jose Eduardo dos Santos, president of the MPLA-Labor Party and of the People's Republic of Angola, received Juliao da Costa, special envoy of the Sao Tome and Principe head of state. Comrade President Jose Eduardo dos Santos received from Juliao da Costa, who is the secretary to the Council of Ministers of Sao Tome and Principe, a personal message from President Pinto da Costa.

MADAGASCAR

FRG Deputy Economic Cooperation Minister Arrives

MB131524 Antananarivo Domestic Service in French 0430 GMT13 May 83

[Text] Dr (Franck Marck Koller), member of the Bundestag and FRG deputy minister of economic cooperation, has arrived in Madagascar to celebrate with us the centenary of the beginning of friendly relations between Germany and Madagascar. These relations were established on 15 May 1883.

Dr (Koller) said that Madagascar is of particular importance to the foreign policy of the FRG. In the field of economic cooperation, he said, the FRG will always guarantee the national independence of each of our countries by respecting Madagascar's policy of nonalignment. On the stabilizaion of the Malagasy economy, Dr (Koller) said his country will always take into account the legal systems of the two partners. [sentence as heard]

A number of Malagasy foreign affairs officials welcomed the distinguished guest at Ivato airport yesterday.

MALAWI

Opposition Leader Seeks Thatcher's Intercession

AB140903 Paris AFP in English 0833 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Dar es Salaam, May 14 (AFP) — The exiled opposition Malawi Freedom Movement (Mafremo) has asked British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to intercede with Malawi's President Hastings Banda to spare the lives of former Justice Minister Orton Chirwa and his wife Vera, recently condemned to death.

Mr Chirwa, who lived in Tanzania until two years ago, was the president of Mafremo. He and his wife were sentenced to death by the country's traditional court after being convicted last week of conspiring to overthrow the government.

The Mafremo president was the first justice minister and attorney-general in post-independence Malawi until 1964 when he fled the country after a disagreement with Dr Banda.

Mafremo Secretary General Machenzie Chirwa, in a letter delivered to the British High Commission here, said the British Government could influence Dr Banda to spare the Chirwas from execution. In his letter, Mr Chirwa said: "Besides being a former colonial power to Malawi and head of the Commonwealth of Nations, Britain has very strong relations with the Government of Malawi and Dr Banda has also high regard for the British Government."

During their trial in Malawi, the Chirwas maintained that they had been kidnapped inside neighboring Zambia by Malawian police.

Parliament To Meet Before Being Dissolved

MB161805 Blantyre Domestic Service in English 1600 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Parliament meets in Zomba tomorrow for a day's scheduled business. An early announcement by the office of the speaker in Zomba said the meeting would start at 0930 and requested all ministers and members of Parliament to attend. It will be the last meeting of Parliament before it is dissolved in 2 days' time to pave the way for the forthcoming parliamentary general elections on 9 June.

MOZAMBIQUE

NOTICIAS Lists Central Committee Members

MB161633 Maputo NOTICIAS in Portuguese 1 May 83 p 10

[Text] In its last session, the Fourth Frelimo Congress elected the new Central Committee, which consists of 130 members. This is more than double the number of members elected to the Central Committee, which was elected by the Third Congress and has now ceased to function.

The Central Committee itself elected the Political Bureau, the Secretariat, and the Control Committee.

The Political Bureau has 11 members, the Secretariat 6, and both Control Committee members are new.

The following are the names of the party cadres who form the Central Committee, which was elected yesterday:

1) Samora Moises Machel; 2) Marcelino dos Santos; 3) Joaquim Alberto Chissano; 4) Alberto Joaquim Chipande; 5) Armando Emilio Guebuza; 6) Jorge Rebelo; 7) Mariano de Araujo Matsinhe; 8) Sebastiao Marcos Mabote; 9) Jacinto Soares Veloso; 10) Mario da Graca Machungo; 11) Jose Oscar Monteiro; 12) Raimundo Domingos Pachilinuapa; 13) Eduardo Tome; 14) Oswaldo Assahel Tazama; 15) Armando Panguene; 16) Joaquim Joao Munhepe; 17) Bonifacio Gruveta Massamba; 18) Manuel dos Santos; 19 — Eduardo da Silva Ninia; 20) Jose Molane; 21) Fernando Matavel; 22) Joao Americo Mpfumo; 23) Aurelio Benete Manave; 24) Antonio Hama Thai; 25) Manuel Jose Antonio; 26) Teresa Amuli Nhalingue; 27) Daniel Saul Banze; 28) Sergio Vieira; 29) Salesio Teodoro Nalyambipano; 30) Pedro Gaivao Odailah; 31) Joao Aleixo Malunga; 32) Tobias Dai;

33) Graca Machel; 34) Jose Luis Cabaco; 35) Julio Carriho; 36) Matias Juma; 37) Teresa Samailane Romao Tembo; 38) Assane Nacir; 39) Augusto Macamo; 40) Bernardo Avelino Magalhaes; 41) Ernesto Trindade Costley White; 42) Jose Pascoal Zandamela; 43) Jose Correira Ganancio; 44) Raimundo Guela Valoi; 45) Marina Pachinuapa; 46) Monica Chitupila; 47) Deolinda Guezimane; 48) Filomena Lukuni; 49) Feliciano Gundana; 50) Joao Baptista Cosme; 51) Alberto Sithole; 52) Zacarias Kupela; 53) Matias Manuel Khapesse; 54) Felix Amane Mudzezere; 55) Lagos Henriques Lidimo; 56) Jose Carlos Lobo; 57) Domingos Fondo; 58) Francisco Parafino Cachaco; 59) Isabel Nkavandeka; 60) Pascoal Mocumbi; 61) Jose Ajape Hussene; 62) Gilion Michila; 63) Gideon Ndobe; 64) Fernando dos Reis Ganhao; 65) Ariel Davide Alfredo; 66) Armando Mungoni Chaque; 67) Fernando Muchanga; 68) Joaquim Manjel Guilundo; 69) Albino Waene Matsinhe; 70) Maria Jose Mucavel; 71) Alberto Macaiuane Langane; 72) Cecilia Miranda Chongo; 73) Mario Soto; 74) Albino Chizinga; 75) Ernesto Macaiamucane Mucache; 76) Hermenegido Mateus Infante; 77) Efraime Jonasse; 78) Laurinda Jose Pequinino; 79) Edgar Zacaria Pene; 80) Tshokisso Munhiwa; 81) Jaime Blusa; 82) Alberto Manuel Saranda; 83) Zeca Carlos Lampiao; 84) Francisco Manuel; 85) Gabriel Mircao; 86) Joao Manuel Zamussa; 87) Elisa Filimone; 88) Solomone Machaque; 89) Lourenco Jose Maria; 90) Zacarias Tomas; 91) Joaquim Aleixo; 92) Fel Chibuho; 93) Julio N'chola; 94) Beatriz Killiasse; 95) Nicolau Fernandes Zalimba; 96) Luciano Kunlinji; 97) Omar Luis Francisco; 98) Joao Bulande Jequecene; 99) Eduardo Roldao da Conceicao; 100) Faquir Ami Chande; 101) Benjamin Maquina; 102) Carlos Mucareia: 103) Germano Jose Joaquim; 104) Avelino Catana; 105) Nicolau Artur Macoro; 106) Ernesto Lucas; 107) Damiao Francisco Lissimba; 108) Alexandre Franco Nkamlamba Thawe; 109) Assumane N'taula; 110) Lourenco Celestino Maulana; 111) Alibe Katungue; 112) Martinho Niuaia; 113) Assane Stambuli; 114) Jose Paulo N'chumali; 115) Angelo Azarias Chichava; 116) Fernandes Rodriqgues Nipine; 117) Lucas Mussa Amisse; 118) Omar Santana; 119) Adelino Cebo; 120) Cardoso Namelavi; 121) Cristina Tembe; 122) Aurelio Manhica; 123) Rosalia Lumbela; 124) Antonio Sumbane; 125) Acadmiel Muthemba; 126) Lameque Mechangula; 127) Eduardo Arao; 128) Manuel Manjiche. [total number of names as published]

The following are the members of the Political Bureau of the Frelimo Party Central Committee, who were elected during the first session of the Central Committee yesterday:

1) Samora Moises Machel; 2) Marcelino dos Santos; 3) Joaquim Alberto Chissano; 4) Alberto Chipande; 5) Armando Emilio Guebuza; 6) Jorge Rebelo; 7) Mariano de Araujo Matsinhe; 8) Sebastiao Marcos Mabote; 9) Jacinto Soares Veloso; 10) Mario da Graca Machungo; 11) Jose Oscar Monteiro.

The following are the members of the Secretariat of the Central Committee, who were elected during the Central Committee's first session yesterday:

1) Samora Moises Machel; 2) Marcelino dos Santos; 3) Joaquim Alberto Chissano; 4) Jorge Rebelo; 5) Armando Panguene; 6) Jose Luis Cabaco.

During its session yesterday, the Frelimo Party Central Committee elected the following members to its Control Committee:

1) Secretary: Mariano Matsinhe; 2) Assistant Secretary: Raimundo Pachinaupa.

SOUTH AFRICA

SADF Has No Comment on Zimbabwean Conviction

MB131431 Johannesburg SAPA in English 1358 GMT 13 May 83

[Excerpts] Pretoria, May 13, SAPA — The SADF has declined to comment on the conviction of a former member of the Rhodesian Special Branch and the Central Intelligence Organisation for preparing to undergo training in South Africa for the purpose of furthering a "political object" in Zimbabwe. In Pretoria today, an SADF spokesman said he had no comment to make on court cases in Zimbabwe — "especially those where South Africa is accused through a suspect legal system."

Treurnicht Renews Appeals for Rightwing Unity

MB151200 Johannesburg RAND DAILY MAIL in English 14 May 83 p 3

[Excerpt] Cape Town — The leader of the Conservative Party, Dr Andries Treurnicht, has renewed his appeal for a united right wing, saying the by-elections had proved that the National Party could be defeated. "They have shown that the CP and the Herstigte Nasionale Party together draw more votes than the National Party," he said in a statement issued in Cape Town this week. "Jointly, therefore, we can bring the government to a fall, thereby stopping this fatal direction it has taken."

He had taken note of the attitude of the HNP leader, Mr Jaap Marais, with disappointment. The CP had taken every reasonable step to establish cooperation and had not fought the HNP in by-elections. "The by-elections have proved beyond doubt that the CP is the instrument through which the NP and its policies can be beaten. We extend the hand of friendship to members of the HNP and invite them to unite their strength with ours to serve our common cause and ensure our freedom through victory," Dr Treurnicht said.

ZAMBIA

Former Cabinet Minister Criticizes Government

MB151350 Johannesburg Domestic Service in English 1330 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] A former Zambian Cabinet minister has castigated the Zambian Government for refusing to buy maize and fertilizers from South Africa at cheaper prices, but preferring expensive Zimbabwean maize. Former Power, Transport, and Communications Minister (Sefelino Mulenga) also blamed the government for leaving large quantities of fertilizers uncleared at South African ports.

ZIMBABWE

Government To Institute 'Executive President'

MB160706 Harare Domestic Service in English 0400 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] The minister of legal and parliamentary affairs, Comrade Eddison Zvobgo, says it is now time to start changes in the present Constitution to make it more suitable for the country. Speaking in a television interview yesterday, Comrade Zvobgo said Zimbabwe would like to have an executive president like other independent countries in the world. He said the government intends to bring about changes to have an executive president because this is the wish of the people. The minister pointed out that this would take some time because the changes should be made legally.

Commenting on allegations of so-called violations of the Lancaster House Agreement, Comrade Zvobgo explained that there has not been a breach of the agreement. He said every amendment to the Constitution was made in strict accordance with the Lancaster House Agreement, adding that the Republican Front leader, Mr Ian Smith, is in the habit of making quite untruthful allegations. This was borne out last month by the British foreign secretary, Mr Francis Pym, who said Zimbabwe has fairly adhered to the provisions of the Lancaster House Agreement.

Mugabe on Councillors' 'Unilateral Decisions'

MB161510 Harare Domestic Service in English 1400 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Kariba — The prime minister, Comrade Robert Mugabe, has criticized some councillors for making unilateral decisions on central government's policies. He said they choose which policies to support and which to ignore. Comrade Mugabe was speaking when he opened the 42nd conference of the Local Government Association in Kariba today. He said this is irresponsible. Comrade Mugabe spoke on the role of mayors and emphasized that their role is civic and that they cannot therefore assume executive powers.

Man Sentenced for Preparing To Train in RSA

MB131224 Johannesburg SAPA in English 1038 GMT 13 May 83

[Excerpt] Harare, May 13, SAPA — A former member of the Special Branch and the Central Intelligence Organisation was yesterday jailed for 3 1/2 years after he was convicted of preparing to train in South Africa to further "a political object" in Zimbabwe.

Harare magistrate, Mr Des Utting, heard that Cephas Ndhlovu, 37, had been approached by his former Rhodesian Special Branch commanding officer, a Mr Branfield, after independence and asked whether he wished to see "how South Africa stands."

In a statement read out in court, Ndhlovu said he had met Mr Branfield "by chance" at a hotel in Bulawayo in October 1981. "He had asked me before, just after the 1980 elections, if I would go to South Africa as I would be in trouble here, as a new government would probably cut my throat for my activities against terrorism," Ndhlovu said.

Ndhlovu, who pleaded not guilty, was convicted of committing acts preparatory to attending a training course in South Africa "for the purpose of furthering a political object by the use of physical force, violence, sabotage, intimidation, civil disobedience or other unlawful means within Zimbabwe."

Mr Utting said: "I think the court can take judicial notice of the fact that there are training camps over the Limpopo River where persons are training to carry out acts of sabotage... and generally disrupt the law and order of this country."

Pretoria Recruits Mercenaries for Destabilization

MB150700 Harare Domestic Service in English 0500 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] The Pretoria regime is recruiting mercenaries from Africa who are infiltrating southern Zimbabwe to terrorize villagers. According to South African refugees in Botswana, the mercenaries wear Zimbabwe National Army camouflage made at a secret factory in the northern Transvaal.

The refugees say racist South Africa is using the recruits to cause tribal conflict in Zimbabwe as part of its destabilization campaign. They added that such mercenaries were also used in the notorious raid on the Lesotho capital, Maseru, in January, when 42 were massacred in a savage and indiscriminate cross-border raid by apartheid-ruled South Africa.

Meanwhile, four Zimbabweans at Dukwe camp near Francistown have confirmed that they were questioned and harassed by such men in (?Gwai) and (Cholocho). The Zimbabweans say the mercenaries spoke to them through soldiers who spoke Shona.

Iraq Accused of Frustrating Relations With Iran

NC132112 Paris AFP in English 1939 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Harare, May 13 (AFP) — The Zimbabwe Government has implicitly accused Iraq of trying to stop it from establishing diplomatic relations with Iran, Iraq's opponent in the three-year-old Gulf war.

In a speech to army officers in Harare, Foreign Minister Witness Mangwende said the Zimbabwe Government had experienced pressure from "one non-aligned nation with whom we have always enjoyed a close relationship" not to set up links with "another sister developing country within the Non-aligned Movement, with whom we also share many common revolutionary aims."

"The reason for the pressure upon us was that these two sister, non-aligned nations are currently at war with each other," the Zimbabwean minister said.

Iran's charge d'affaires, Mostafa Seyyed Aghaie, presented his credentials here last month. Iraq has had relations with Zimbabwe at ambassadorial level since June 1981.

Although Mr Mangwende did not say what kind of pressure had been exerted on Zimbabwe, reliable sources in Harare have indicated it may have involved trade. Iraq was for the period January-November 1982 the seventh largest customer for Zimabwean exports, mainly tobacco, according to official statistics. In those 11 months, Iraq imported 28.6 million Zimbabwe dollars (29.7 million U.S.) worth of Zimbabwean products, behind South Africa, the United States and four West European countries.

Harare Radio To Broadcast SWAPO Programs

LD151715 Lisbon in Portuguese to Europe 1300 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] SWAPO, the organization which has fought for the independence of Namibia for the last 15 years, will be starting a series of radio broadcasts to counter those of South Africa.

The director of programs for Zimbabwe Radio told the SUNDAY MAIL of Harare that the government has made facilities available toSWAPO from which to broadcast programs three times a week. Such programs will be heard in South Africa and Namibia. The Voice of Namibia will broadcast from 0200 hours, local time, 2200 hours Lisbon time [as heard], on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays.

The SWAPO programs will be similar to those broadcast by the Voice of Zimbabwe from Mozambique during the 7-year independence war against the white minority. The broadcasts are aimed at correcting all information on Namibia issued by South Africa in its transmissions for Namibia and southern Africa, the director said.

The number of broadcasts will be increased if there is evidence that their impact is effective in South Africa and particularly in Namibia, he said.

Radio Truth Warns of Move To Check Opposition

MB122005 (Clandestine) Radio Truth in English to Zimbabwe 1700 GMT 12 May 83

[Text] Radio Truth has information that teams of blacks are to be used by the Central Intelligence Organization [CIO] in a new insiduous move. The team members, posing as members of a religious organization, the African Christian Council, are to ask questions of people concerning their attitude to the Mugabe regime. The teams are to test both black and white opinion and are to begin their activities in the (Shabani) area. The teams will report back to CIO in Harare on the attitude of individuals, and those opposed to the regime could find themselves in detention.

There is no such organization as the African Christian Council, so people in the (Shabani) area are warned to be very careful over the next month when talking to any stranger.